DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 686 CG 003 577

By-Sokol, Alvin; Marshall, Jon C.
Inquiry into Innovations. Independent Students--American Studies.
University City Senior High School, Mo.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 68
Note-207p.
EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$10.45
Descriptors-*American History, *Demonstration Projects, Demonstrations (Educational), *Educational Innovation, *Experimental Curriculum, *Independent Study, Individualized Curriculum, Individual Study, Secondary Education, Social Studies

The Demonstration Schools Project was established for the purpose of upgrading American education through the enhancement of communication among educators concerning many of the new and improved procedures being initiated in the schools. As a member of this demonstration unit, the University City High School's innovations (such as flexible scheduling, unique course offerings, student unscheduled time, cooperative teaching, interdisciplinary approaches to the curriculum, and administrative reorganization) are available for visitors to observe. The first research project, reported here, identifies and describes the independent student and shows how he differs from the non-independent student. The American Studies course offered to 11th-grade students was selected for the study because it incorporates flexible scheduling, unique content, team teaching, interdisciplinary approaches, and other innovations. The program is described in detail, and contrasted with traditional American History programs. Extensive data is presented evaluating the program. This program was funded under a Title III Elementary and Secondary Education Act grant. (BP)

ED026686

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

IN QUIRY TO IN NOVATIONS

INDEPENDENT STUDENTS--AMERICAN STUDIES

RESEARCH REPORT I

1968

DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS PROJECT
UNIVERSITY CITY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
TITLE III OF ESEA PUBLIC LAW 89-10
Ronald M. Compton, Director

Alvin P. Sokol

Jon C. Marshall

CG 003 577

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . *i*

LIST OF TABLES. . . . . *iii*

FOREWORD . . . . *viii*

PART

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE INDEPENDENT STUDENT 5

INTRODUCTION 5

PURPOSE 8

PROCEDURE 8

RESULTS 10

DISCUSSION 18

REFERENCES 21

III. AMERICAN STUDIES: OBJECTIVES 22

REFERENCES 31

IV. ANALYSES OF RELATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH INVENTORIED BEHAVIORS OF AMERICAN STUDIES STUDENTS AND CONVENTIONAL AMERICAN HISTORY STUDENTS 33

INTRODUCTION 33

BACKGROUND 35

PURPOSES 38

RESEARCH QUESTIONS 38

Page

METHOD 42

Measurement Instrument. 42
Sample. 45
Data Collection 47
Data Analysis 47

RESULTS 55

Teachers' Perceptions 55
Students' Perceptions 79
Congruence 81

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS 108

REFERENCES 144

APPENDIX A: American Studies Course Outline 146

APPENDIX B: Impact of New Ideas in Education: American Studies 165

APPENDIX C: Watson Analysis Schedule. 172

APPENDIX D: WAS Answer Sheet 183

APPENDIX E: Tables, Rotated Factor Solutions. 185

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Significance of the Difference Between Mean Accumulative Averages for Independent and Not-Independent Students 11

2 Significance of the Difference Between Mean Ranks in Class for Independent and Not-Independent Students 11

3 Significance of the Difference Between Mean Intelligence Quotients for Independent and Not-Independent Students 12

4 Significance of the Difference Between Mean Modules of Unscheduled Time for Independent and Not-Independent Students 13

5 Significance of the Difference Between Mean Class Loads for Independent and Not-Independent Students 14

6 Significance of the Relation Between Being College Bound or Not College Bound and Being Denoted Independent or Not-Independent Students. . . 15

7 Significance of the Relation Between Disciplinary Problems and Independent or Not-Independent Students 16

8 Significance of the Difference Between Mean Number of Absences for Independent and Not-Independent Students 17

9 Significance of the Relation Between the Sex of Students and Being Denoted Independent or Not-Independent Students 18

10 Tentative Behavioral Objectives for the American Studies Program 27

11 Summary of Research Questions 41

12 Summary of Data Analyses Procedures 49

Table Page

13 Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Unrotated Factor Solution 57

14 Teachers' Perceptions of Actual Expectations: WAS, Part II; Unrotated Factor Solution 58

15 Teachers' Perceptions of Realized Expectations: WAS, Part III; Unrotated Factor Solution 59

16 Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Teachers, WAS, Part I, Factor Solution 60

17 Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Teachers, WAS, Part II, Factor Solution 60

18 Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Teachers, WAS, Part III, Factor Solution 61

19 Mann-Whitney U Test of Significance of the Difference Between the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part I 62

20 Mann-Whitney U Test of Signifcance of the Difference Between the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part II 62

21 Mann-Whitney U Test of Significance of the Difference Between the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part III 63

22 Fisher Exact Probability Test of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part I 63

23 Fisher Exact Probability Tests of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part II 64

24 Fisher Exact Probability Tests of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part III 65

25 Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Directions of Factor Loadings for Unrotated Factor Solution 65

Table Page

26 Teachers' Perceptions of Actual Expectations: WAS, Part II; Directions of Factor Loadings for Unrotated Factor Solution 67

27 Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part III; Directions of Factor Loadings for Unrotated Factor Solutions 68

28 Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part I, Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Explanations 70

29 Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part II, Teachers' Perceptions of Actual Explanations 73

30 Items Associated with Nine Unrotated Factors; Part III, Teachers' Perceptions of Realized Expectations 76

31 Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Unrotated Factor Solution 82

32 Students' Perceptions of Actual Expectations: WAS, Part II; Unrotated Factor Solution 85

33 Students' Perceptions of Realized Expectations: WAS, Part III; Unrotated Factor Solution 88

34 Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Students, WAS, Part I, Factor Solution 91

35 Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Students, WAS, Part II, Factor Solution 92

36 Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Students, WAS, Part III, Factor Solution 92

37 Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance of the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep, C1, and C2 (Students): WAS, Part I 93

38 Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance of the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep, C1, and C2 (Students): WAS, Part II 93

Table Page

39 Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance of the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep, C1, and C2 (Students); WAS, Part III 93

40 Chi-Square Test of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep, C1, and C2 Groups (Students): WAS, Part I. 94

41 Chi-Square Test of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep, C1, and C2 Groups (Students): WAS, Part II 95

42 Chi-Square Test of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep, C1, and C2 Groups (Students): WAS, Part III. 96

43 Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part I, Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations 97

44 Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part II, Students' Perceptions of Actual Expectations 100

45 Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part III, Students' Perceptions of Realized Expectations 104

46 Factor Descriptions of Teachers' Perceptions 109

47 Teacher Factors Associated with Programs 113

48 Items on the WAS Which Were Responded to in the Same Direction by Most Teachers Regardless of Program 116

49 Items on the WAS Which Discriminate Between Teachers in the Experimental and Conventional Programs 120

50 Factor Description of Students' Perceptions 123

51 Student Factors Associated with Programs 128

52 Items on the WAS Which Were Responded to in the Same Direction by Most Students Regardless of Program 132

53 Items on the WAS Which Discriminate Among Students in the Experimental and Conventional Programs 134

Table Page

54 Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution 185

55 Teachers' Perceptions of Actual Expectations: WAS, Part II; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution 186

56 Teachers' Perceptions of Realized Expectations: WAS, Part III; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution 187

57 Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution 188

58 Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part II; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution 191

59 Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part III; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution 194

FOREWORD

Forward-looking school districts have attempted to upgrade the quality of their educational programs. Many of these districts have set forth statements of beliefs, goals and philosophy. New programs and teaching strategies have been incorporated into their general curricula to reflect these statements. The degree to which these are being realized through the implementation of the new programs is of interest to school personnel.

It has been possible to make some assessment of the effectiveness of new programs through the media of reports from participants and similar subjective means of appraisal. The level of certainty one may claim from data accumulated by this type of observation, however, lacks the cogency of the level which is based upon data which are gathered systematically and analyzed according to methods consistent with modern research and statistical techniques.

Elementary and secondary schools, therefore, are utilizing educational research to a continually greater extent. Until recently, most educational research was confined primarily to the university laboratory. The research carried on at this level generally focused upon development and testing within theoretical frameworks. It has been meaningful within this context. However, a considerable amount of time usually passed, and often many research projects had to be completed before meaningful applications were found for the elementary and secondary classroom. That this should have been so is a function of both the nature of scientific investigation and verification and the rather slow rate of change on the part of the schools which had prevailed. The acceleration of innovation in school districts has created a new immediacy in terms of the necessity for "feedback" of more cogent information concerning changes made in the school program.

The increased necessity on the part of the schools for information, however, has not been met in all cases with a corresponding increase in the capacity of research to deliver data quickly and in useable form. In many instances a standardized instrument for measurement of an innovative program does not yet exist. The lack of normative information for newly-developed instruments is a drawback, albeit not a critical one. The investigations carried on within the school setting are in the nature of *ex post facto* research, and the careful control and manipulation of variables which are possible in a laboratory setting are not always possible. Consequently, relationships which are found to exist between school practices and student behaviors may in fact be caused by concomitant variables which are difficult to determine. Since the accumulation of knowledge by research methods is a slow, building process, often piece after piece of knowledge from study after study must be fitted together until a pattern emerges in the manner of a mosaic. Thus, one may achieve greater understanding of a concept.

Taking all these cautions into account, the writers believe that research methodology offers a unique promise and can be utilized effectively within the framework of the innovative school. The promise held out is that of attainment of more certain knowledge than would be attainable through any other way of knowing; of asking very basic questions, the answers to which are of vital concern to those interested in the directions taken by education.

Alvin Sokol
Research Coordinator
of Special Projects

Jon C. Marshall
Research Consultant
University of Missouri-
St. Louis

PART I

INTRODUCTION

The Demonstration Schools Project was established for the purpose of upgrading education in America through the enhancement of communication among educators concerning many of the new and improved procedures being initiated into the schools. Through this medium, ideas and experiences may be shared among educators and thus disseminated to the wider population of the general education establishment. Towards this end, educators have been issued general invitations to visit innovative, demonstration schools in operation.

As a member of this demonstration unit, the University City High School's innovations such as flexible scheduling, unique course offerings, student unscheduled time, cooperative teaching, interdisciplinary approaches to curriculum, and administrative reorganization can be readily observed. Visitors are shown the system in action; they talk with various school personnel; and they are given written materials describing the innovative procedures. Similarly, personnel from University City public schools have been afforded the opportunity to visit other schools for the purposes of sharing and gaining new educational ideas and experiences. These personal visitations and the published materials have initiated in a systematic way and thus improved communication of the organization of the innovative procedures and have provided for subjective analyses of these procedures.

The research component of the demonstration school team can aid this demonstration process by providing more objective information as to the nature of selected innovations. Behavioral objectives can be further clarified. Pertinent questions concerning the process of innovations and their effects on the learning process can be analyzed.

The research component of this team of school personnel can also provide feedback information to the administration and classroom teachers. The relation between innovative procedures and students' behaviors should be of interest to all personnel. The degree to which an innovation has been realized and accepted in the perceptions of the students will be a factor in the success of any innovation. These concerns, as well as many others, fall within the domain of the research team.

It was with these concerns that the researchers undertook projects designed to provide information on selected aspects of one of University City High School's programs, American Studies. This program incorporates many of the innovative procedures previously mentioned.

A statement of the beliefs and guiding philosophy under which the University City School District operates has been put forth in written form. At the Senior High School level, Dr. Mark A. Boyer, principal, circulated a series of letters to the high school staff and students detailing the administrative reorganization and innovative practices which had been initiated in order to attain goals based upon this philosophy. It is noteworthy that this process of change in the Senior High was generated from within the ranks of the school personnel.

The series of letters was collated by Mrs. Max Balcom, teacher-writer, and Lois Hachtmeyer, Co-ordinator of Dissemination, as an historical note to educators who are interested in the manner in which the process of change takes place in an educational setting. The school's "Statement of Philosophy and Objectives" and the series of letters, published under the auspices of The National Demonstration Schools Project (Title III of ESEA), suggested the basic direction for the research summarized in this report.

This report is the accumulation and analysis of data as a result of interaction of University City School personnel, written beliefs of the Senior High School, and the initiation of innovative school programs. The data set forth in this report were collected during the spring semester (February through June) of 1968.

The research undertaken during this first five month period focused primarily upon portions of two paragraphs comprising part of the school's "Statement of Philosophy and Objectives."

1. "The schools of University City exist primarily to serve the youth of this community, and the society in which they live through aiding them to become responsible, perceiving, self-directing individuals who are capable of making decisions and value judgments."
2. "Learning takes place when the experiences are meaningful in terms of the goals of the learner. Whatever a student does is done in terms of his private view of what he ought to do, given the situation as he sees it. It involves what he thinks he is doing, what he thinks is involved in the task, and previous experiences with the task. Learning is usually related to the purposes of the learner rather than to purposes of the teacher."

The first statement stresses the maximum development of a functioning individual. Upon interaction between the researchers and teachers, the term "independent, self-directed student" (subsequently called the "independent student") emerged. It seemed to the researchers that this term was being used in a conceptual sense to identify the students described in the first statement. However, neither the educational characteristics nor the behavior of the independent student were defined in an objective, behavioral sense. Therefore, the first project was an attempt to identify and describe the independent student and to determine in what manner he differs from the not-independent student.

Curricular programs can be divided into four general categories: (1) teachers' goals, (2) teachers' activities, (3) content, and (4) students' behavior. The American Studies course offered to eleventh grade students was selected for study because it incorporates innovative procedures such as flexible scheduling, unique content, team teaching, interdisciplinary approaches to subject matter, as well as other practices. The American Studies Outline provides an overview of the teachers' activities and the content selected for study. The structure of the program in terms of the teachers' goals and students' behaviors could be further clarified. In order to provide information for general communication and for feedback to the teachers studies were undertaken to formulate the teachers' goals in behavioral terms and to analyze students' behaviors.

The researchers would like to acknowledge Dr. Martin Garrison, Superintendent of University City Schools, Dr. E. E. Watson, Assistant Superintendent, Mrs. Glenys Unruh, Assistant to the Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Dr. Mark Boyer, principal of University City Senior High School, and Mr. Ronald Compton, Director of Special Projects. Their concern for gaining objective research data concerning school programs and practices and their cooperation has aided the task of the research component of the Project.

PART II

THE INDEPENDENT STUDENT

Introduction

> The schools of University City exist primarily to serve the youth of this community, and the society in which they live through aiding them to become responsible, perceiving, self-directing individuals who are capable of making decisions and value judgments.[1]

The foregoing statement reflects that basic philosophy under which the University City High School is operating. The emphasis here is on the development of *responsible, perceiving, self-directing individuals* capable of *making decisions* and *value judgments*. The ultimate objectives[1] which have been written for the school reflect this same philosophy. Emphasis is placed on the development of affective skills such as civic competence, socially responsible behavior, and loyalty; rather than *just* cognitive gains. The learning of cognitive skills is still deemed important. However, these skills generally are not the only ends. Throughout the administrative and classroom system, one can easily find evidence of the importance placed on the total development of the individual.

Mandatory study halls for every person have been abandoned. Students are given the opportunity to select between courses and unscheduled time. The students are allowed to use their unscheduled time in a variety of ways. They are encouraged to utilize the Learning Resource Center, laboratories, art rooms and the like. "Self-directing" students are encouraged to engage in indepth study projects as part of their academic course load. In these and many other ways, the instructional personnel of the educational system are attempting to provide students with more opportunities for making decisions and value judgments and to develop into more responsible, perceiving, self-directing individuals.

Similarly, changes have been initiated into the instructional and administrative procedures. Modular flexible scheduling has been adopted. This allows for varying time periods within and among course offerings. Cooperative teaching (such as American history and English) has been undertaken in some programs. School time has been provided teachers for individual and group planning. The letter grade of "X" has been established as a non-passing grade which a student is allowed to have changed to a passing grade through additional work in the area of deficiency.

The many changes in the school as an educational system have been designed to enhance the total development of individuals who will be functioning within society. Thus, greater emphasis has been placed upon the development of affective characteristics. With this change has emerged a new construct; independent, self-directing students (termed here, *independent students*).

The term independent as used here is not the opposite of dependent. The psychological definition of dependency can be stated as "...the subject's dependency upon people and his probable use of persons as symbols of constructs."[3] The converse would be the subject's lack of dependence upon people. The psychological definition is thus quite different from one that would necessarily reflect the characteristics of a responsible, perceiving, self-directed individual.

For quite some time, social psychology has been concerned with the importance of an individual's membership groups on his attitudes and values.[4] The development of students who qualify for membership into the independent student group seems to be one of the priorities of teachers in the "new" schools. It has become important in the "new" school to develop within the capacity of each individual such processes as perceiving, communicating, and decision making. Since the term independent student is used to describe this "new" teacher priority group, this concept of the independent student is central to the development of the total individual.

Before engaging in the study, several basic questions were asked:

1. What is independence? If a student is classified as an independent student, what is it that makes him different from students who are not similarly classified?
2. Are there significant relations between independence and other educational criteria such as academic performance, ability, educational-vocational plans, and absenteeism?
3. Is there a significant relation between independence and sex?
4. What is the relation between independence and the selection of unscheduled time?

These questions are but representative of the many questions which should be asked concerning the independent student.

If school personnel accept the challenge of aiding students in becoming independent, responsible individuals capable of making decisions, then the personnel need to consider at least the following two questions:

1. What are the characteristics of independent students?
2. Can independence be measured, thus enabling the early diagnosis of those lacking the quality?

The latter question is of primary concern. If this quality called independence is one of those the school personnel are attempting to develop in students, then the early diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses in the quality should aid the education team in planning strategies for approaching individuals or groups of students. In this respect, diagnosis of the level of independence could be similar to the diagnosis of reading disabilities. However, before a diagnostic instrument can be constructed, the characteristics of independent and not-independent students need to be determined. This development of the construct can be from a practical orientation with little or no theory involved.[2] Therefore, groups of independent and not-independent students were identified and selected variables analyzed for their relation to independent and not-independent classifications.

Purpose

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the general characteristics of independent students and to determine those characteristics which differentiate independent students from not-independent students as teachers perceive them in a genuine school setting. It is felt that the information gained from this study and other studies which are still in progress may enable the researchers to construct a measurement instrument for early diagnosis of deficiencies in this characteristic.

Procedure

The general method of the investigation was to identify those high school students who could be considered independent students and those who could be considered not-independent students, and then to analyze selected variables for their relation to the independent-not-independent classifications. The sample of students was taken from the eleventh grade class at University City

High School. The eleventh grade class was used because (1) the majority of this class would have been attending the school for more than one year and (2) this would allow for follow-up data and thus further study of these students during grade twelve.

Each of the 35 teachers who had classroom contact with grade eleven students were requested to submit the names of the five students whom they felt best characterized independent, self-directed students and the names of five students whom they felt least characterized independent, self-directed students (or best characterized not-independent students). The teachers submitted the names of 60 independent and 58 not-independent students.

It is interesting that of the 118 names submitted (from a total of 525 students in the eleventh grade class), there were no students whose names appeared in both groups. Furthermore, about one-fourth of the students received two or more nominations. This consistency in the selection of independent and not-independent students indicates the likelihood of homogeneity among teachers in their perceptions of the construct.

The teachers were not provided guidelines for their selection of students. They were to select students who fit with their perceptions of independent and not-independent. The lack of structure was necessary in order to analyze this construct from the practical orientation of the classroom teacher. The degree of consistency in the selection of students previously noted takes on even greater significance in light of the lack of guidelines for making nominations.

The 118 students were studied from both empirical and subjective frameworks. The areas selected for empirical study were (1) achievement level, (2) ability level, (3) selection of activities, (4) program orientation, (5) school problems, and (6) sex of the student. These six areas were operationally defined as follows:

1. Achievement level -- student's accumulative average and his rank in class.
2. Ability level -- student's *Henman-Nelson* Intelligence Quotient as obtained in grade nine (or a reasonable substitute).
3. Selection of activities -- number of modules (15-minute periods) of unscheduled time per week selected by a student and the number of classes a student enrolled in during the spring semester of the 1967-1968 school year.
4. Program orientation -- whether a student is identified by his counselor as appearing to be college bound or not being college bound.
5. School problems -- whether or not a student is known as a disciplinary problem to the disciplinary officer for the school and the number of absences during the fall semester of the 1967-1968 school year.
6. Sex of the student -- whether the student is a male or a female.

These variables were analyzed using the appropriate mean comparisons and frequency comparisons. The .05 level of confidence was used for all statistical analyses.

The subjective segment of the study consisted of interviews with selected students from each of the two groups. This portion of the study is still in progress and thus the results will not be presented in this report.

Results

The results of the empirical segment of the investigation indicate that all of the variables selected for study were significantly related to the independent-not-independent dichotomy (see Tables 1-9).

Those students classified as independent were significantly higher achievers than were the not-independent students. This can be noted in Table 1 and Table 2. Table 1 contains the summary information for the students' accumulative averages and Table 2 the summary information for the students' ranks in class. The mean and standard deviation of the accumulative average for the independent students were 2.7948 and .4986, respectively, and

TABLE 1

Significance of the Difference Between Mean Accumulative Averages for Independent and Not-Independent Students

Group	No.	Mean*	SE	t	df	Significance
Independent	60	2.7948	.0950	+13.7148	116	$P < .001$
Not-Independent	58	1.4914				

*Based on three-point system ranging from 0.00 to 3.00

TABLE 2

Significance of the Difference Between Mean Ranks in Class for Independent and Not-Independent Students

Group	No.	Mean*	SE	t	df	Significance
Independent	60	119.5166	22.4851	-15.0705	116	$P < .001$
Not-Independent	58	458.3793				

*Based on a class of 525 students

for the not-independent students were 1.4914 and .5242, respectively. The accumulative average is based on a 3-point system ranging from 0 for non-passing achievement to 3 for superior or honors achievement. The two groups tend to be about equally variable. However, the independent students tend to be evaluated by their teachers as superior students while the not-independent students tend to be evaluated by their teachers as having met the minimum passing requirements. This same basic information can be obtained from the class ranks. The mean and standard deviation of the class ranks for the independent students were 119.5166 and 111.2788, respectively, and for the not-independent students were 458.3793 and 129.8270, respectively. The class ranks are based on a total class enrollment of 525 students. As previously noted, the two groups tend to be about equally variable. However, the independent students tend to be assigned grades which place them in the upper one-fourth of the class while the not-independent students tend to be assigned grades which place them in the lower one-fourth of the class.

As could be surmised from the achievement data, independent students obtained significantly higher ability scores than did not-independent students (see Table 3). The ability scores were obtained for most of the students from the *Henman-Nelson Intelligence Test* which was administered in grade nine.

TABLE 3

Significance of the Difference Between Mean Intelligence Quotients for Independent and Not-Independent Students

Group	No.*	Mean	SE	t	df	Significance
Independent	60	126.8333	3.2397	+5.9511	114	$P < .001$
Not-Independent	56	107.5535				

*I.Q. information missing for two not-independent students

In a few cases, the test was administered at a later date and in two cases no ability information was available. The mean and standard deviation of the I.Q.'s for the independent students were 126.8333 and 16.4561, respectively, and for the not-independent students were 107.5535 and 18.0237, respectively. Again, the two groups tend to be about equally variable. However, the independent students tend to obtain I.Q. scores which would indicate superior ability while the not-independent students tend to obtain I.Q. scores which would indicate average ability.

Independent students tend to select more courses and less unscheduled time than do the not-independent students. Table 4 contains the summary information on students' unscheduled time and Table 5 contains the summary information on students' class loads.

TABLE 4

Significance of the Difference Between Mean Modules of Unscheduled Time for Independent and Not-Independent Students

Group	No.	Mean*	SE	t	df	Significance
Independent	60	20.65	1.8855	-3.5587	116	$P < .001$
Not-Independent	58	27.36				

*Based on the number of modules of unscheduled time per week

TABLE 5

Significance of the Difference Between Mean Class Loads for Independent and Not-Independent Students

Group	No.	Mean*	SE	t	df	Significance
Independent	60	2.6375	.0600	+4.3033	116	$P < .001$
Not-Independent	58	2.3793				

*Based on .5 units per semester course, 6 courses = 6 * .5 = 3.0 units

The unscheduled time was figured in modules per week. This time included the students' lunch periods as well as other time not otherwise accounted for on the students' schedule cards. The mean and standard deviation of the modules of unscheduled time for independent students were 20.65 and 9.63, respectively, and for not-independent students were 27.36 and 11.23, respectively. The variability of unscheduled time with the groups were about the same, but the means were considerably different. After routinely subtracting 10 modules per week for lunch periods (only 30 minutes per day) per student, the means would be 10.65 and 17.36, respectively. Thus, the not-independent students tend to select nearly twice as much unscheduled time (without considering the lunch period) as do the independent students. This same tendency can be noted by examining the class loads. The mean and standard deviation of the class load for independent students were 2.6375 and .2828, respectively, and for not-independent students were 2.3793 and .3661, respectively. The difference between the means (significant at the .001 level) indicates that the independent students tend to enroll in slightly more courses than do not-independent students.

The analysis of the data indicated that there was a significant relation between those students identified as being apparently college bound and those not college bound and the independent-not-independent dichotomy (see Table 6).

TABLE 6

Significance of the Relation Between Being College Bound or Not College Bound and being Denoted Independent or Not-Independent Students

	Observed Frequencies		Expected Frequencies	
	Independent	Not-Independent	Independent	Not Independent
College Bound	57	35	46.7728	45.2272
Not College Bound	3	23	13.2184	12.7812

$\chi^2 = 18.6501$, df = 1, $P < .001$

A significantly higher proportion of independent students than not-independent students appeared to be college bound. It can be noted that the majority of both groups exhibited this characteristic. However, 95 per cent of the independent students appeared to be college bound while only 62 per cent of the not-independent students appeared to have this same orientation.

The data analysis also indicated that there was a significant relation between disciplinary problems and the independent-not-independent dichotomy (see Table 7). For this study, a student was denoted as a disciplinary problem if he was known as a disciplinary problem to the school official who normally handles disciplinary cases.

TABLE 7

Significance of the Relation Between Disciplinary Problems and Independent or Not-Independent Students

	Observed Frequencies		Expected Frequencies	
	Independent	Not-Independent	Independent	Not-Independent
Disciplinary Problem	0	21	10.6764	10.3236
Not a Disciplinary Problem	60	37	49.3148	47.6852

$\chi^2 = 25.0199$, df = 1, $P < .001$

None of the 60 independent students had been brought to his attention for disciplinary action. However, 21 of the 58 not-independent students were known to him as disciplinary problems. The percentages of students from the groups who were denoted as discipline problems were 0% and 36%, respectively. Even though the majority of the students in both groups were not known as disciplinary problems, significantly more not-independent students than independent students had been brought to the attention of the disciplinary officer.

The number of absences somewhat parallels discipline problems in that chronic absenteeism and discipline problems often go hand-in-hand. Consequently, it is not surprising that the not-independent students were absent from school significantly more often than were the independent students (see Table 8).

TABLE 8

Significance of the Difference Between Mean Number of Absences for Independent and Not-Independent Students

Group	No.	Mean*	SE	t	df	Significance
Independent	60	4.3750	1.1222	-5.6884	116	$P < .001$
Not-Independent	58	10.7586				

*Based on the number of absences for the fall semester of the 1967-1968 school year.

The typical independent student was absent from school about 4 days during the first semester, while the typical not-independent student was absent from school almost 11 days during the same period. The not-independent student has a rate of absenteeism which is about 2.5 times as great as that of independent students.

The relation of the independence construct to achievement and classroom procedure can again be noted in the sex distribution. It has been noted in previous studies that girls tend to achieve better than boys and that they tend to be closer than boys to the accepted mode of classroom behavior. Similarly, a significant relation was found between sex and the independent-not-independent dichotomy (see Table 9). Twenty-three of the independent students were males and 37 were females, while 45 of the not-independent students were males and 13 were females. The percentages within independent and not-independent categories were 39% independent males, 61% independent females, 78% not-independent males, and 22% not-independent females.

TABLE 9

Significance of the Relation Between the Sex of Students and being Denoted Independent or Not-Independent Students

	Observed Frequencies		Expected Frequencies	
	Independent	Not-Independent	Independent	Not-Independent
Male	23	45	34.5712	33.4288
Female	37	13	25.4288	24.5712

$\chi^2 = 17.0205$, df = 1, $P < .001$

Discussion

The profile of typical independent and not-independent students might be as follows: The independent student will probably be a highly intelligent female who is college bound. She will likely take a relatively heavy class load, attend school regularly, have relatively little unscheduled time, and obtain high marks, thus ranking in the top one-fourth of her class. The not-independent student will probably be a male of average intelligence who is college bound. He will likely take a lighter class load, attend school less regularly, have a relatively larger amount of unscheduled time, and obtain lower marks, thus ranking in the bottom one-fourth of his class. Furthermore, if a student is not college bound or if he is known as a disciplinary problem, he will probably be a not-independent student.

It is interesting that a differential in the choice of scheduling options between the independent and not-independent groups was found. The innovation of unscheduled time was intended to increase the options from which students could select meaningful activities and thus develop in their ability to become more responsible, self-directed persons. One might expect that as students develop these attributes, they would select a greater amount of self-directed activity. However, the data indicate that those students classified as being independent tend to select the option of additional course work rather than unscheduled time more often than do those students classified as not independent. The educational orientation of the independent student group has already been noted. This behavior may be a result of that orientation.

The overall data would seem to indicate that teachers impute the quality of independence to those students who possess conventional qualities--such as academic achievement, ability, and conformity to school norms--which have always been rewarding to teachers.

This investigation raises many questions. The following three questions represent a promising direction for further inquiry.

1. Do teachers use the term *independent student* to denote the high-achiever, or are there additional dimensions to the construct of independence which have not been measured here?
2. Have teachers a standard, apart from conventional qualities, which they use in determining whether or not a student is developing independence?
3. Are the variables in this study the critical ones for separating the two groups? Or, are they so highly correlated with the actual criteria for membership in these groups that they cannot be readily separated in the configurational aspects of teachers' perceptions?

This study was undertaken in order to attempt to clarify the construct of the independent student. The definition of this construct seems to exist conceptually in that teachers tend to speak of the *independent student* and of *developing independence in students*. The attempt was made, therefore, to arrive at behavioral and operational definitions by examining attributes of students imputed by their teachers to have or to lack the qualities of the independent student.

References:

1. Boyer, M. A. *et. al.* The Process of Change at the Senior High School. (University City, Missouri) A Publication of the National Demonstration Schools Project, Title III of ESEA, 1966, pp. 20-22

2. Cronbach, L.J. and Meehl, P.A. "Construct Validity in Psychological Tests." Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 281-302.

3. Kelley, George A. The Psychology of Personal Constructs. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York, 1955, pp. 239-240.

4. Sherif, M. and Sherif, C. Groups in Harmony and Tension. Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, 1953.

PART III

AMERICAN STUDIES: OBJECTIVES

American Studies is an innovative program designed to provide students with a better understanding of the American heritage. Incorporated into this program are many of the administrative systems changes such as cooperative teaching and planning; modular scheduling; utilization of a lecture hall, regular classrooms, and small conference rooms; and independent study. There are six teams of teachers with each team consisting of one English and one American history teacher. Classroom planning is done within each team and across all six teams. Within the general framework of the program, each team structures its own classes. This provides for general consistency among teachers in the program and yet allows for individual differences among teachers and students.

The general plan in American Studies is to focus on key areas and issues in American history. To maximize the effectiveness of this approach, American literature and composition have been collated with the teaching of the history so as to provide a cohesiveness between the areas which is seldom realized in school curriculum. The use of a single commercially published text has been abandoned. Paper back books, library materials, current articles, and the like are used as study materials. The classroom activities utilized within the program are highly varied. They are comprised of such techniques as large group lectures, role playing, and class discussions. A teacher team might meet a class of 50 students as a large group, or they might separate the class into two or more groups for small group presentations, discussions and the like. The cooperative teaching system, extended class periods, and the freedom to *build* a quality program have enabled much greater flexibility in classroom procedures.

The central concept in American Studies is the American dream. Within this frame of reference, the American Studies teachers seem to be attempting to develop within students skills in inquiry, decision-making, and creative thinking as well as an understanding of key issues and associated literature in American history. Towards this end, the teachers have restructured the conventional American history and English curricula. An outline has been prepared by the American Studies teachers which provides a comprehensive view of the general content which has been selected for use by them. This outline is included as Appendix A. However, in order to enhance continuing program development and general communication the behavioral objectives of the program and the specific activities utilized by the teachers need to be further clarified. One issue of a publication of the School District of University City entitled Impact of New Ideas in Education provides a good overview and feeling for the American Studies program (see Appendix B). A more extensive *working document* collating the content, objectives, and activities of the program should be prepared. Such a document could serve several purposes. One of these is the establishment of guidelines against which teachers could compare, update, and evaluate their procedures and measure and evaluate the achievements of their students. The guidelines could be an aid in the orientation of new teachers initiated into the program. Furthermore, such a document could serve the Demonstration School Project as a mode of communicating to other educators the structure of the American Studies system.

The project reported in this section of the report is the first stage in the development of guidelines: the development of written behavioral objectives for the American Studies program. This procedure envolves the development of generalized goals which are broken down into their behavioral components. The process envolves the drafting and redrafting of behavioral statements until the final product reflects the exact student behaviors that the American Studies teachers feel are important in their program. The process begins with the goals identified by the classroom teachers, modification and delineation of the goals, and finally the teachers' acceptance of the list of behavioral statements.

The general method for the preparation of the objectives was to (1) identify the general goals of American Studies, (2) review written materials describing the purposes, goals, and materials for the American Studies program and for social studies programs in general, and (3) collation and translation of the information into behavioral statements. The statements prepared were submitted to the American Studies teachers for critical evaluation. They were then revised and resubmitted for evaluation by the teachers. The objectives which are presented in this section of the report are still tentative because the second evaluation was not able to be completed before the end of the 1967-1968 school year. The objectives will be finalized during the fall semester of the 1968-1969 academic year.

During the preliminary stages of this project, the American Studies teachers were requested to submit to the research team the goals of their program. Several statements of the ultimate goals and activities of the program were subsequently submitted to the researchers. These statements were general in nature and consisted of a mixture of the general focus (*i.e.*, the American dream), content, goals, and activities of American Studies. These points of emphasis were consistent with the general focus recommended in current social studies literature. The subsequent search through the literature aided the researchers in the clarification and delineation of the goals.

The next stage of the project consisted of reviewing key works (see references 1-16) in social studies education for goal statements and program recommendations, collating this information, and then correlating the results with the general orientation provided by the teachers. This procedure resulted in 57 written behavioral statements which were subdivided into the following six areas: (1) Skills in logical thinking, (2) Skills in developing hypotheses and generalizations, (3) Skills in applying logical thinking, hypotheses, and generalizations, (4) Skills in the comprehension and recall of information, (5) Skills in composition, and (6) Skills in literature. The statements were behavioral criteria for possible expected student learnings. They did not deal directly with content or activities. Rather, they were concerned with learning processes. These objectives consisted of statements such as, "Can list the assumptions made in selected material," "Can identify in writing (or selecting) the interrelationships among ideas," and "Can recall selected facts in American History." As can be noted, these statements generally focused on the process of learning rather than the *what* and *how* of learning. The content and activities identified by the teachers would define the latter two concepts.

The American Studies teachers critically evaluated the preliminary draft of objectives. Their major objection to the prepared statements was the researchers' choice of the six general categories. They objected to the isolating of skills in composition and literature as separate learning categories. The American Studies teachers indicate that American literature is not legitimately separable from American history; the objectives for English and literature should not be artificially separated from those objectives for American history; and that the skills in composition and literature were for the most part included under the other four areas.

The evaluations also included detailed editorial comments on all the entries and suggested deletions and additions.

The suggested comments were utilized in the preparation of the second draft of the behavioral objectives. The second draft consisted of 24 (now 25) statements classified according to the following four categories: (1) Skills in logical thinking, (2) Skills in developing and analyzing hypotheses and generalizations, (3) Skills in applying logical thinking, hypotheses, and generalizations, and (4) Skills in the comprehension and recall of information. Table 10 contains the tentative list of objectives.

TABLE 10

Tentative Behavioral Objectives for the
American Studies Program

SKILL AREAS OBJECTIVES

I. SKILLS IN LOGICAL THINKING

- a. Can identify the purpose of a statement, argument, document, or literary work
- b. Can identify the point of view of a statement, argument, document, or literary work
- c. Can identify the main idea of a statement, argument, document, or literary work
- d. Can reconstruct goals, attitudes, or policies which were associated with a given action
- e. Can list the assumptions made in selected materials
- f. Can identify logical inconsistencies, ambiguities, or fallacies in statements under consideration
- g. Can generalize to a principle from a set of factual information
- h. Can translate a principle into a concrete example
- i. Can explain the similarities and differences among issues, policies, and events within the context of selected recurring themes in American Studies

II. SKILLS IN DEVELOPING AND ANALYZING HYPOTHESES AND GENERALIZATIONS

- a. Can identify the problems and their subproblems when confronted with statements of issues, policies or historical events
- b. Can list (or select) tentative statements offering explanations for or solutions to selected problems, issues, policies or events
- c. Can support or reject arguments, explanations, and proposed solutions with statements of facts, records, historical personalities and the like

SKILL AREAS | OBJECTIVES

d. Can differentiate between relevant and irrelevant information used in the support of arguments, explanations, and proposed solutions

e. Can write (or select) logical implications of given problems, issues, policies or events

f. Can logically accept, modify or reject a hypothesis on the basis of given information

g. Is willing and able to use a variety of sources in seeking information

III. SKILLS IN APPLYING LOGICAL THINKING, HYPOTHESES, AND GENERALIZATIONS

a. Can recognize and state one's own beliefs, opinions and values

b. Can differentiate between objective evidence and personal bias when preparing explanations for or solutions to problems, issues, policies or events

c. Can recognize bias in a given selection of information

d. Can prepare explanations for or solutions to problems, issues, policies or events in a reasonable period of time

e. Can demonstrate the willingness and ability to use a variety of types of evidence to support or reject explanations for or solutions to problems, issues, policies or events

f. Can analyze and evaluate the foundations of American political, social, and economic institutions

IV. SKILLS IN THE COMPREHENSION AND RECALL OF INFORMATION

a. Can recall selected names, facts and ideas in American Studies

b. Can define selected terms and literary devices in American Studies

c. Can present the point of view of selected persons in American history

It can be noted from Table 10 that the majority of the statements focus on higher mental processes rather than rote recall of information. It can further be noted that the statements as presented do not limit or specify content. They do, however, stipulate the skills with which students are expected to handle selected content and, in some instances, the means by which he should be able to demonstrate his competency in dealing with content. It is interesting, and logical, that the English composition and literature skills have been integrated with the social studies skills to the extent that it would be very difficult to separate the American Studies goals along the conventional American history and English academic lines.

Even a superficial analysis of the objectives listed in Table 10 should result in the realization that the goals of American Studies depart radically from those of the conventional American History and American Literature courses. In the first place, the goals of the conventional courses generally would fall exclusively under the last category -- "Skills in the comprehension and recall of information." Yet in the American Studies program only 3 out of 25 or 12% of the goals are in this category. The American Studies teachers are not slighting the comprehension and recall of information. Rather they are attempting to do much more than this. They expect their students to not only *know* about American history and literature, but also to be able to *use* what they know.

It needs to be re-emphasized that what has been presented here are obtentative behavioral objectives for American Studies, and that these objectives represent only one aspect of the program. As much an integral part of the program as the objectives are the content and learning activities. All three of these interlocking parts need to be described before maximum communication among other educators concerning the nature of the program can be expected. However, since the latter two aspects of concern are being continually modified and updated, no document should be prepared which attempts to present American Studies as a *totally structured program*.

Finally, the competencies of the teachers required to teach successfully for these objectives cannot be overlooked. The teacher oriented toward conventional practices would probably find it difficult to accomplish effectively what this program is attempting. The teachers in this program must obviously be well educated and have an excellent understanding of American history and literature. They should have a good understanding of (and be sensitive to) human behavior and group dynamics. They need to be self-critical and flexible in order to continuously evaluate their own and students' behaviors in learning situations. Furthermore, they need to be sensitive to the needs of the teacher group since this is a cooperative teacher system rather than an intact group-individual teacher system. As indicated here, the successful operation of the American Studies program requires good instructional personnel. The characteristics mentioned here are but a few of those which are needed for the successful development and operation of a dynamic teacher-evolved program which is attempting to focus on the development of the individual's higher-order mental process.

References:

1. Balcom, Max. "American Studies." Impact of New Ideas in Education. School District of University City, University City, Missouri, 37, (1968).

2. Berman, Louise M. New Priorities in the Curriculum. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus, Ohio, 1968, 241 pp.

3. Burton, William H.; Kimball, Roland B.; and Wing, Richard L. Education for Effective Thinking. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960, 508 pp.

4. Cox, Benjamin C. and Massialas, Byron G. Social Studies in the United States. Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., Chicago, 1967, 355 pp.

5. Fair, Jean and Shaftel, Fannie R. (ed.) Effective Thinking in the Social Studies. National Council for the Social Studies, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1967, 257 pp.

6. Fenton, Edwin. Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., Chicago, 1966, 526 pp.

7. Fenton, Edwin. The New Social Studies, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., Chicago, 1967, 144 pp.

8. Hunt, Maurice P. and Metcalf, Lawrence E. Teaching High School Social Studies. Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York, 1955, 471 pp.

9. Hunt, Maurice P. and Metcalf, Lawrence E. (2 ed.) Teaching High School Social Studies. Harper & Row, Publishers, Evanston, 1968, 463 pp.

10. Massialas, Byron G. (ed.) "The Indiana Experiments in Inquiry: Social Studies." Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, 39, (May, 1963), 142 pp.

11. Massialas, Byron G. and Cox, Benjamin C. Inquiry in Social Studies. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1966, 353 pp.

12. Massialas, Byron G. and Smith, Frederick R. (ed.) New Challenges in Social Studies. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965, 261 pp.

13. Metcalf, Lawrence E. "Research on Teaching the Social Studies". In N.L. Gage (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Rand McNally & Company, Chicago, 1963, 929-965.

14. Morse, Horace T. and McCune, George H. (4 ed.) Selected Items for the Testing of Study Skills and Critical Thinking. National Council for the Social Studies, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1964, 91 pp.

15. Oliver, Donald W. and Shaver, James P. Teaching Public Issues in the High School. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, 330 pp.

16. Parker, Cecil J. and Rubin, Louis J. Process as Content: Curriculum Design and the Application of Knowledge. Rand McNally & Company, 1966, 66 pp.

PART IV

ANALYSES OF RELATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH INVENTORIED BEHAVIORS OF AMERICAN STUDIES STUDENTS AND CONVENTIONAL AMERICAN HISTORY STUDENTS*

Introduction

> Learning takes place when the experiences are meaningful in terms of the goals of the learner. Whatever a student does is done in terms of his private view of what he ought to do, given the situation as he sees it. It involves what he thinks he is doing, what he thinks is involved in the task, and the previous experiences with the task. Learning is usually related to the purposes of the learner rather than to purposes of the teacher.[5]

The foregoing statement reflects in part the basic beliefs under which the University City High School is operating. The emphasis here is on the individual student; on his perceptions of his needs and abilities, of the teacher's expectations, and of his actual behaviors. This emphasis upon the student's perceptions of the learning situation is consistent with the cognitive theory of learning.[7]

The American Studies program has been cited as reflecting University City High School's move "away from the traditional classroom".[2] As was noted in the previous part, "American Studies: Objectives," the goals for this program emphasize higher-order mental processes which are important in teaching students to think as contrasted with the rote memorization of information.

---

*This investigation was done with the cooperation of Elizabeth P. Watson, Instructor, University of Missouri-St. Louis, who allowed investigators unlimited access to the information she is collecting for her doctoral dissertation which is being written under Dr. Shirley H. Engle, Indiana University.

The American Studies program has been in operation for four years. The "newness" of the approach which is being taken is reflected in the administrative structure accompanying the program and the methods for selection of content. The utilization of modular, flexible scheduling, common planning time for teachers in the program, access to a resource room, cooperative teaching, independent study time for students, access to a variety of classroom facilities reflect the administrative innovations which have played a significant role in the development of this program. The teachers were given the opportunity to exercise their expertise in the development of the content of the program. The initial task of course content organization was to select correlated themes from history and literature, and, where appropriate, to include art, architecture, music and philosophy. Two themes were selected: the *American dream* and the *American character*. Materials have been selected on the basis of providing students, wherever possible, with an understanding and conceptual feel of the problems and choices in the turning points in American life. Insofar as possible, primary source material is being used. Much of the material is mimeographed and assembled in loose-leaf notebooks for distribution to each student.

The successful operation of this type of innovative program is in part based on several organization problems. The first and most important problem is that of staffing the program with the quality of teachers necessary to meet the increased demands of the program. For maximum effectiveness, the teachers must have good academic backgrounds; they must be able to break with convention and be willing and able to try new and different classroom procedures; and they must be able to work with and respect other members of the teaching team. In order to function successfully in this system, these characteristics are necessary but not sufficient. The teachers must have the time and opportunity to design curriculum, review and select materials, and develop "new" teaching procedures. They need adequate space for the organization, duplication and storage of materials. Furthermore, they need adequate para-professional assistance in order to handle properly the large amount of material which accompanies the program.

The program, which has been in operation for four years, involves 6 teams of teachers and about 525 students. The results of an informal survey, conducted at the end of the third year, indicated that "...both teachers and students expressed favor with the new program".[2]

Background

The direction of current social studies curricular innovations is toward a process oriented position.[1,4,9] In general the nature of the innovations is a deviation from the conventional content position in terms of changes in curricular and administrative organization, based on an acceptance of different instructional goals and assumptions.[10,12,14] As was previously indicated, this direction of change can be noted in the American Studies program. The one additional innovative facet of the program, which, if anything, is slighted in this report, is the fusion of American literature and history into a cohesive whole. The goals of the program emphasize primarily the higher-mental processes involved in decision-making and inquiry.

The results of past studies,[3,13,14] designed to research effective means for achieving these goals, have failed to demonstrate significant differences in types of goal achievements between the conventional and innovative procedures. This lack of significant differences is frequently assumed to be related to the absence of reliable and/or valid measurement instruments for many of the proposed goal achievements. However, these experimental results may be a concomitant of many interrelated variables.

Role theory[11] would imply that successful goal attainment in the classroom would be related to at least three variables: (1) the means for achieving these goals which are employed by the teachers, (2) the student's perception of the goals to be attained, and (3) the student's acceptance or rejection of the goals to be attained. Past research has focused on the relation between the means for achieving and goal attainment. Seemingly, these studies have assumed that teacher identification and implementation of the means for achieving particular goals are the *only* necessary and sufficient facets of goal attainment, and that this attainment should be measurable *after* relatively short instructional periods. However, the success of achieving such goals is logically and psychologically dependent on adequate communication of the goals to the student and his acceptance of them.[6,11,15] Consequently, any curricular research on innovative procedures might logically begin with the assessment of the student's perception and acceptance of the goals. In fact, over a relatively short period of instructional time (*e.g.*, one academic year) one might expect gross differences in goal expectations with little differences in general achievements. Generalizable differences in general achievements might logically be identifiable only over long periods of consistently different instructional procedures. It would seem, then, that the questions generally researched in curriculum studies might be premature ones in that first the research should determine whether or not students in innovative programs perceive themselves doing things and working toward goals which are different from students in conventional programs.

The extent to which either process, content or both of these orientations are accepted or implemented in actual practice is largely unknown. Identification of goals which are actually operational in classroom situations is complicated by a variety of factors. Among these would be the degree to which teachers' verbalized goals and their actual expectations coincide. Teachers may or may not consciously attempt to identify goals of instruction. But even teachers who never consciously identify goals do communicate to their students expectations for their classroom. The actual outcome of instruction will be influenced by the expectations of the teacher as perceived by the learner.[8]

It seems to follow, then, that in addition to the concern about the identification of desirable goals for teaching in innovative programs, there should also be concern about the communication of role expectations which are *consistent* with these goals. It might be well to ask teachers (and students) what role they think they (teachers) are defining for students, how the students perceive this definition and finally how the students translate it into their actual behavior.

Rather than use less direct methods, perhaps a good way to begin to learn what teachers think they are doing, and what the students perceive, is to ask them. The inventory in Appendix C (Watson Analysis Schedule) was designed for this purpose. In light of the current use of a content-process dichotomy, special attention in the inventory was given to those role characteristics which might be associated with these orientations. The items in the inventory were judged by its author to be those most relevant to the following three categories under a process or content orientation: purposes, behaviors associated with practices, and affective characteristics.

Purposes

The primary purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent to which the innovative program of American Studies is associated with different role identification of students and teachers as compared to conventional programs.

The secondary purposes of this investigation were: (1) to study the relation between teacher and student expectations within and among the two types of programs and (2) to study the relation among the congruences of teacher's verbalized expectations, perceived expectations, and actual behaviors between and among students and teachers in the American Studies program and conventional programs.

Research Questions

The purposes of this investigation can be summarized in the following if-then hypothesis.

> *If* programs differ *then* students within the programs will perceive different expectations.

Analysis of this hypothesis is dependent upon the analysis of several concomitant research hypotheses. Therefore, this study has been designed to analyze the following research (see Table 11):

1. Do teachers in conventional programs and the teachers in American Studies have the same or different expectations for their students?
2. Do students in conventional programs and students in American Studies perceive the same or different expectations?
3. Will the actual student behaviors in conventional programs and in the American Studies program be the same or different as perceived by the teachers?

4. Will the actual student behaviors in conventional programs and in the American Studies program be the same or different as perceived by the students?
5. Will students and teachers in conventional programs show a greater, lesser, or the same degree of agreement on the expectations of student behavior when compared to students and teachers in the American Studies program?
6. Will students and teachers in conventional programs show a greater, lesser, or the same degree of agreement on actual student behavior when compared to students and teachers in the American Studies program?
7. Will the degree of congruence between what students think they are told they are expected to do and what they feel they are actually expected to do be greater, lesser, or the same between students in conventional programs and students in the American Studies program?
8. Will the degree of congruence between what students think they are told they are expected to do and what they feel they actually do be greater, lesser, or the same between students in conventional programs and students in the American Studies program?
9. Will the degree of congruence between what students think they are actually expected to do and what they feel they actually do be greater, lesser, or the same between students in conventional programs and students in the American Studies program?
10. Will the degree of congruence between what teachers indicate students have been told they are expected to do and what

teachers indicate is actually expected of students to do be greater, lesser, or the same between teachers in conventional programs and teachers in the American Studies program?

11. Will the degree of congruence between what teachers indicate students have been told they are expected to do and what teachers indicate students actually do be greater, lesser, or the same between teachers in conventional programs and teachers in the American Studies program?
12. Will the degree of congruence between what teachers indicate students are actually expected to do and what teachers indicate students actually do be greater, lesser, or the same between teachers in conventional programs and teachers in the American Studies program?

text continues on page 42.

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Groups Compared	Relations among programs	
	Within Scales	Between Scales
Teachers	1. Expectations of students 3. Actual behaviors of students	10. Congruence between verbalized and actual expectations 11. Congruence between verbalized expectations and actual behaviors 12. Congruence between actual expectations and actual behaviors
Students	2. Expectations of students 4. Actual behaviors of students	7. Congruence between verbalized and actual expectations 8. Congruence between verbalized expectations and actual behavior 9. Congruence between actual expectations and actual behaviors
Teachers and students within each program (agreement)	5. Expectations of students 6. Actual behaviors of students	
	Numbers refer to the question numbers.	

Method

The general plan of this study was to obtain selected measurements on students' perceptions of their learning behavior for students enrolled in American Studies and for students enrolled in conventional American history courses. These measurements were then analyzed in accord with the research questions previously presented.

Measurement Instrument. Current research and development in social studies have been concerned with producing evidence which might help identify those variables which are most significantly related to goal attainment. As previously indicated, this research has been focused on the degrees of goal attainments associated with specific instructional procedures. However, role theory indicates that within the framework of a specified social system (*e.g.*, school classrooms) the degree of goal attainment depends not only upon the role identified by the classroom teacher (*e.g.*, instructional procedures) but also upon the communication of the teacher's expectations and the student's acceptance or rejection of these expectations.

Thus it is theorized that goal attainment must be preceded by (1) perception of the expectation and (2) acceptance of the perceived expectation. Perception, therefore, is not a sufficient condition to goal attainment but it is a necessary condition since an expectation which has not been communicated cannot be accepted. When behavior is consistent with defined expectations communication must have occurred. But when it is not consistent there is noise in the system, either communication has not occurred or the expectation has been communicated but does not fit the need disposition of the participant.

The measurement instrument selected for use in this investigation was the Watson Analysis Schedule (WAS) because it was designed to measure selected aspects of the communication of expectations, need disposition, and actual behaviors. The WAS is contained in Appendix C. The schedule is divided into three parts with each part containing the same 71 items but consisting of different directions for responding to the items.

Part I represents the students' perceptions of expectations which were communicated through explicit verbalizations.

Part II represents the students' perceptions of expectations which were (1) communicated explicitly and not rejected on the bases of conflicting implicit communication, (2) communicated explicitly but rejected on the bases of conflicting implicit communication, and (3) communicated implicitly by cues other than the verbalization of the expectations.

Part III represents the students' perceptions of actual behavior and, theoretically, indicates by compliance or non-compliance the acceptance or rejection of the expected behavior as being consistent with his own need disposition.

The 213 items (three sets of 71) in the WAS can be grouped according to the following three categories.

1. Purposes: *e.g.'s*, "52. Learn how to make decisions in the real world." and "60. Understand human society because of what is learned in class."
2. Behaviors: *e.g.'s*, "34. Take notes from teacher lectures." and "23. Define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies."
3. Affective Characteristics: *e.g.'s*, "69. Believe that the teacher understands them." and "65. Make decisions that really matter."

Even though the WAS contains 213 items, it can be administered to a high school group in a 45 minute period. Therefore, it was able to be administered to all students during regular class periods.

Reliability and validity information available on the WAS is sketchy. However, test-retest reliability estimates currently available indicate that the lower bound coefficient is .563 over a week interval which is quite respectable for an affective measurement instrument. The effects of fatigue due to the length of the inventory (213 items) have been analyzed by estimates of the test-retest reliabilities over a week period for the three parts. These estimates (again lower bound) ran from a high of .561 to a low of .525 which were not statistically significant ($P > .05$, $F < 1$, $df=2/76$ using a Randomized Blocks design). Therefore, it was concluded that fatigue does not have an adverse effect on the responses obtained on the WAS.

No evidence is yet available on the empirical validity of the WAS. However, construct validity can be supported logically since the items reflect variables which were identified from social studies literature as associated with the content and process orientations.

The response procedure for the WAS was designed to reflect the respondent's "sureness" of the expectations or actual behaviors reflected by the items. The items are marked according to a five-point scale ranging from "VERY SURE that the statement is *true*" to "VERY SURE that the statement is *not true*." Originally, the statements were to be rated according to the perceived frequency of the behavior expected. However, rating in terms of frequency on Part I seemed inappropriate since frequency of verbalization does not necessarily represent the intensity of the expectation communicated by the verbalization. Therefore, the response method was changed to ask the respondents to indicate the degree to which they were certain that a given statement represented an expectation. The respondents would then identify items which were perceived by the intensity of the communication as well as the frequency. A specially designed Digitek 100 answer sheet was used by all subjects for recording responses to the inventory (see Appendix D).

Sample. As previously indicated, the sample consisted of the students enrolled in American Studies classes and students enrolled in conventional American history classes. The students enrolled in the innovative American Studies program and the teachers will be considered here as the experimental group (Ep). The conventional comparison groups consisted of students and teachers from two other school districts in St. Louis County. These groups will be considered the control samples and will be labeled as groups C1 and C2. The control schools were selected on the following bases: (a) they had to represent students and teachers in conventional social studies programs and (b) they each had to resemble the experimental school on a composite of five quantitative, five qualitative, and six teacher descriptive variables.

The following five quantitative variables reflected comparative size and financial bases of the school and community.

1. Total enrollment in grades K-12
2. Pupils in average daily attendance in grades 9-12
3. Total number of teachers for grades 9-12
4. Number of high school graduates in 1966
5. Assessed valuation per pupil in ADA, K-12

The following five qualitative variables reflected the quality of educational effort and inferentially the general socio-economic setting in the schools' community.

1. Cost per pupil in ADA, grades K-12
2. Teacher to student ratio for grades 9-12
3. Administrator/supervisor to student ratio for grades K-12

4. Per cent of teachers with 150+ hours of academic credit, K-12

5. Per cent of graduates entering college in 1966.

The six descriptive variables indicate the experience and stability of the teaching faculty. Of the following six variables, the first three reflect experience and the last three reflect stability.

1. Per cent of first year teachers in grades K-12
2. Per cent of teachers with 6-9 years' experience, K-12
3. Per cent of teachers with 30+ years' experience, K-12
4. Per cent of teachers first year in present position, K-12
5. Per cent of teachers 6-9 years in present position, K-12
6. Per cent of teachers 10+ years in present position, K-12

The rank-orders of each of the 23 AAA school districts in St. Louis County (excluding the Special School District) on each of these 16 criteria were summed to determine a composite rating. The composite values for the two districts chosen as controls were closer to the composite value for University City Public Schools than were the composite scores for any of the other 20 districts.

The two identified districts were invited to participate in the study. Their full cooperation was extended to the researchers.

The two control groups represented schools which are similar to the University City Public Schools, but in which the American history and literature classes are organized in the conventional manner where one teacher meets with about 25 students one hour per day, five days per week. There is no cooperative teaching such as is characteristic of the American Studies' teacher teams. A commercially published text is used in the conventional class and single unit classrooms were assigned to the teachers. The control group differed in that C1 took into account individual ability differences through the use of a three track system. For both C2 and Ep only the "slower" students were placed into special sections. The total enrollments in the three programs were 525, 550, and 657 for Ep, C1, and C2, respectively.

Data Collection: The data were collected during the months of April and May for all three groups. The Watson Analysis Schedule was administered in two sessions to the students and teachers in the experimental group. All students enrolled in morning sections of the American Studies program meet during that scheduled time in a large lecture room. The data were collected in a one-hour period. This procedure was repeated for students and faculty in a second session in the afternoon. Data were gathered during the regular class periods in the control schools. A sufficient number of monitors was used so that no loss of class time occurred when transferring from one room to another. In addition, floating monitors were used in case relief was necessary and the investigator was able to keep a continuous check on all simultaneous administrations.

Data Analysis: Correlational analyses were done to analyze the several research questions. These analyses included the following factor analyses and Pearson product-moment correlational analyses.

1. The responses of the 29 teachers were analyzed using three factor analyses, one for each part of the WAS (see Table 12, analyses 1, 2, and 3).
2. The expected item values on the WAS for the three teacher groups were analyzed using nine Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, between each of the three parts for the three groups (see Table 12, analyses 4, 5, and 6).

3. The responses of 90 randomly selected students (30 from each program) were analyzed using three factor analyses, one for each part of the WAS (see Table 12, analyses 7, 8, and 9).
4. The expected item values on the WAS for the three student groups were analyzed using nine Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, between each of the three parts for the three groups (see Table 12, analyses 10, 11, and 12).
5. The expected item values on the WAS for the six student, teacher groups were analyzed using nine Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, between the students and teachers in each of the three programs for the three parts (see Table 12, analyses 13, 14, and 15).

As is indicated in Table 12, follow-up tests (Fisher Exact Probability Test, Chi-Square, and z-tests) were used for each analysis. The first two tests were used following the factor analyses to test the significance of the differences among groups in the direction (+ or -) of bipolar factor loadings. The z-tests were used to test the significance of the differences between pairs of correlation coefficients. The .05 level of confidence was used as the rejection level for all statistical analyses.

text continues on page 55.

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSES PROCEDURES

Analysis No.	Statistical Procedures	Information Yielded
1	a. Factor Analysis, Q-Technique, Teachers, Part I of the WAS	a. The types of explicitly stated expected behaviors (factors) of students as seen by the teachers
	b. Fisher Exact Probability Test	b. The significance of the difference between teachers in the experimental group and the teachers in the pooled control groups in the direction (+ or -) of the bipolar factor loadings
2	a. Factor Analysis, Q-Technique, Teachers, Part II of the WAS	a. The types of actually expected behaviors (factors) of students as seen by the teachers
	b. Fisher Exact Probability Test	b. The significance of the difference between teachers in the experimental group and the teachers in the pooled control groups in the direction (+ or -) of the bipolar factor loadings
3	a. Factor Analysis, Q-Technique, Teachers, Part III of the WAS	a. The types of actual behaviors (factors) of students as seen by teachers
	b. Fisher Exact Probability Test	b. The significance of the difference between teachers in the experimental group and the teachers in the pooled control groups in the direction (+ or -) of the bipolar factor loadings

TABLE 12 (continued)

Analysis No.	Statistical Procedures	Information Yielded
4	a. Pearson product-moment correlations between the expected item values for teachers on Part I and Part II of the WAS for each of the three groups	a. The degree of consistency between what teachers indicate they have told students they are expected to do and what students are actually expected to do for each of the three programs
	b. z-tests for the significance of the differences of the correlation coefficients among the three groups	b. The significance of the differences in the degrees of consistency among the three programs between what teachers indicate they have told students they are expected to do and what students are actually expected to do
5	a. Pearson product-moment correlations between the expected item values for teachers on Part II and Part III of the WAS for each of the three groups	a. The degree of consistency between what teachers indicate they have told students they are expected to do and what students actually do for each of the three programs
	b. z-tests for the significance of the differences of the correlation coefficients among the three groups	b. The significance of the differences in the degrees of consistency among the three programs between what teachers indicate they are expected to do and what the students actually do

TABLE 12 (continued)

Analysis No.	Statistical Procedures	Information Yielded
6	a. Pearson product-moment correlations between the expected item values for teachers on Part II and Part III of the WAS for each of the three groups	a. The degree of consistency between what teachers indicate students are actually expected to do and what students actually do for each of the three programs
	b. z-tests for the significance of the differences of the correlation coefficients among the three groups	b. The significance of the differences in the degrees of consistency among the three programs between what teachers indicate students are actually expected to do and what students actually do for each of the three programs
7	a. Factor Analysis, Q-Technique, Students, Part I of the WAS	a. The types of explicitly stated expected behaviors (factors) of students as perceived by the students
	b. Chi-Square Test of Independence	b. The significance of the differences among students in the three programs in the direction (+ or -) of the bipolar factor loadings
8	a. Factor Analysis, Q-Technique, Students, Part II of the WAS	a. The types of actually expected behaviors (factors) of students as perceived by the students
	b. Chi-Square Test of Independence	b. The significance of the differences among students in the three programs in the direction (+ or -) of the bipolar factor loadings

TABLE 12 (continued)

Analysis No.	Statistical Procedures	Information Yielded
9	a. Factor Analysis, Q-Technique, Students, Part III of the WAS	a. The types of actual behaviors (factors) of students as perceived by the students
	b. Chi-Square Test of Independence	b. The significance of the differences among students in the three programs in the direction (+ or −) of the bipolar factor loadings
10	a. Pearson product-moment correlations between the expected item values for students on Part I and Part II of the WAS for each of the three groups	a. The degree of consistency between what students indicate they have been told they are expected to do and what they perceived they are actually expected to do for each of the three programs
	b. z-tests for the significance of the differences of the correlation coefficients among the three groups	b. The significance of the differences in the degrees of consistency among the three programs between what students indicate they have been told they are expected to do and what they are actually expected to do
11	a. Pearson product-moment correlations between the expected item values for students on Part I and Part III of the WAS for each of the three groups	a. The degree of consistency between what students indicate they have been told they are expected to do and what they indicate they actually do for each of the three groups
	b. z-tests for the significance of the differences of the correlation coefficients among the three groups	b. The significance of the differences in the degrees of consistency among the three programs between what students indicate they have been told they are expected to do and what they actually do

TABLE 12 (continued)

Analysis No.	Statistical Procedures	Information Yielded
12	a. Pearson product-moment correlations between the expected item values for students on Part II and Part III of the WAS for each of the three groups	a. The degree of consistency between what students indicate they are actually expected to do and what they actually do for each of the three groups
	b. z-tests for the significance of the differences of the correlation coefficients among the three groups	b. The significance of the differences in the degrees of consistency among the three programs between what students indicate they are actually expected to do and what they actually do
13	a. Pearson product-moment correlations between the expected item values for students and teachers on Part I of the WAS for each of the three groups	a. The degree of agreement between students and teachers on explicitly stated student expectations for each of the three groups
	b. z-tests for the significance of the differences of the correlation coefficients among the three groups	b. The significance of the differences among the three programs in the degrees of agreement between students and teachers on explicitly stated student expectations
14	a. Pearson product-moment correlations between the expected item values for students and teachers on Part II of the WAS for each of the three groups	a. The degree of agreement between students and teachers on actual student expectations for each of the three groups
	b. z-tests for the significance of the differences of the correlation coefficients among the three groups	b. The significance of the differences among the three programs in the degrees of agreement between students and teachers on actual student expectations

TABLE 12 (continued)

Analysis No.	Statistical Procedures	Information Yielded
15	a. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between the expected item values for students and teachers on Part III of the WAS for each of the three groups	a. The degree of agreement between students and teachers on actual student behavior for each of the three groups
	b. z-tests for the significance of the differences of the correlation coefficients among the three groups	b. The significance of the differences among the three programs in the degrees of agreement between students and teachers on actual student behavior

Results

As was previously indicated, the primary purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent to which the innovative program of American Studies is associated with different role identification of students and teachers as compared to conventional programs. Toward this end, the *WAS* was administered to the students and teachers comprising the American Studies program (designated the Ep group), and to the students and teachers in two comparable high schools with conventional American history programs (designated groups C1 and C2).

The mode of analysis for comparing teachers' perceptions of students' roles and students' perceptions of their own roles consisted of Principal Axis Factor Analyses and Varimax Rotations of the obtained factor solutions. These solutions permitted the utilization of subsequent appropriate comparison techniques.

Teachers' Perceptions. The inventory was administered to 29 teachers; Ep = 12, C1 = 8, C2 = 9. The inventory responses for these 29 teachers were correlated as the initial step toward the factor solution. This procedure, denoted as the Q-technique, yielded analyses of the respondents. The Principal Axis Factor Solution groups the respondents in accord with their mode of responding to item clusters. The first factor represents two item clusters: those items which are answered similarly by all respondents and one group of items which differentiates among respondents who obtain high and low loadings on this factor. The remaining factors are bi-polar in nature and, therefore, indicate opposite modes of responding to the item clusters comprising the respective factors.

Factor solutions were obtained for the teachers' perceptions as represented on each part of the *WAS*: Part I, Explicit Expectations; Part II

Actual Expectations; Part III, Realized Expectations. The factor solutions for these three parts are presented in Tables 13, 14 and 15 respectively; the solutions consisted of 7 to 9 factors. An examination of these tables will indicate that the first factor represents a cluster of items which were answered similarly by all teachers in that the factor loadings are all in a positive direction. However, the differences in levels of loadings on this factor indicate the presence of a second cluster of items to which the respective teachers did not answer in common. Factors 2 through 7 (or 9) represent clusters of items which differentiate between groups of teachers, some responding in a positive direction toward those clusters of items, and others responding in a negative direction.

As is characteristic of the Principal Axis Factor Solution, the first factor accounts for the largest single portion of accountable variation; the second factor accounts for the next largest portion of accountable variation, and so on. This characteristic can be observed for each of the factor solutions in Tables 16, 17, and 18. As this would suggest, the first factor generally represents the largest number of items, with a progressively smaller number of items comprising each succeeding factor.

Tests of significance were applied to determine whether or not the directions of factor loadings were independent of membership in the experimental and control groups. The two control groups were combined (denoted C) for these analyses because of the small sample sizes. Since the Principal Factor contains only positive loadings, the Mann-Whitney U Test of Significance of Differences of Ranks (rank order of factor loadings with the first rank assigned to the lowest factor loading) was applied to this factor. The results of this test for each of the three parts are presented in Tables 19, 20, and 21. As can be noted in the Tables, the American

text continues on page 61.

TABLE 13

Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Unrotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
EP	1	.700	-.325	-.235	-.121	-.270	.207	.058
	2	.419	.252	.032	-.415	.392	.171	.050
	3	.738	.079	.259	-.172	.159	.182	.007
	4	.667	-.418	.178	.021	.242	.057	.101
	5	.717	-.457	-.013	.020	.026	-.062	.214
	6	.778	.107	-.315	-.236	.050	.113	.166
	7	.479	.093	.476	-.331	-.136	.041	.044
	8	.793	-.090	-.109	.075	.025	-.023	.120
	9	.719	-.362	-.002	-.157	-.028	-.023	.120
	10	.592	-.154	.204	.206	-.368	.018	-.387
	11	.714	-.099	-.152	.123	-.315	.211	.013
	12	.739	-.032	-.138	.088	-.267	-.078	.080
C1	1	.489	.323	.184	.411	.262	-.305	-.217
	2	.537	.424	-.225	.319	.022	-.094	.056
	3	.597	.456	-.271	.271	-.149	.022	-.094
	4	.687	-.144	-.098	.092	.122	-.219	-.041
	5	.408	.297	.216	-.292	-.198	-.177	.347
	6	.580	.051	-.100	.471	.290	.014	.327
	7	.352	.654	-.098	-.066	.139	.149	-.142
	8	.273	.266	-.543	-.079	-.159	.316	.052
C2	1	.687	-.155	-.074	-.108	-.227	-.247	.098
	2	.419	.128	.488	.191	-.065	.081	.342
	3	.461	.260	.127	.199	-.315	-.553	-.157
	4	.699	-.046	-.047	.019	.245	.001	-.157
	5	.545	-.388	-.064	-.092	-.031	.013	-.292
	6	.198	.417	-.361	-.402	-.247	-.336	-.185
	7	.703	-.237	.187	-.063	.330	.030	-.216
	8	.415	.486	.365	-.043	-.142	.204	.180
	9	.285	.372	.372	.126	-.041	.415	-.349

TABLE 14

Teachers' Perceptions of Actual Expectations: WAS, Part II; Unrotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ep	1	.758	.267	.156	.281	.069	.013	-.128
	2	.687	-.073	-.099	.037	-.408	-.037	-.205
	3	.672	.077	-.303	-.070	.028	-.290	.152
	4	.583	.482	.230	.438	.065	.166	-.049
	5	.507	.430	.364	.028	.068	.455	.090
	6	.791	-.104		.194	-.039	-.057	-.102
	7	.705	-.002	-.122	.011	-.150	.186	.340
	8	.818	.051	.013	.128	.083	-.065	.009
	9	.725	.220	-.214	-.047	-.216	-.053	.017
	10	.517	.038	-.300	-.461	.308	.010	.026
	11	.886	.108	-.112	-.100	-.143	-.071	-.071
	12	.711	.117	-.140	-.066	.206	-.149	-.240
C1	1	.453	-.161	.539	-.201	.333	.102	.105
	2	.596	-.421	.212	.058	.092	-.262	.026
	3	.678	-.462	-.008	.026	.288	-.025	-.068
	4	.725	.168	.237	-.142	-.019	.152	-.106
	5	.545	-.118	-.389	.186	.308	.036	.082
	6	.711	.292	.287	.220	.177	-.016	.024
	7	.680	-.355	.217	-.334	-.218	-.157	-.082
	8	.216	-.553	.552	.052	-.092	-.331	.059
C2	1	.724	-.153	.035	.278	.150	-.133	-.310
	2	.736	-.020	.164	.094	.127	-.013	.056
	3	.535	-.424	-.301	.110	.076	.320	.305
	4	.680	.169	.238	-.233	-.306	.113	.009
	5	.541	.261	-.246	-.239	.041	-.179	.213
	6	.064	-.534	-.096	.527	-.411	.135	.185
	7	.669	.216	.067	-.265	-.391	.033	.171
	8	.223	-.463	-.176	-.227	-.095	.483	-.558
	9	.379	-.528	-.001	-.176	.151	.294	.260

TABLE 15

Teachers' Perceptions of Realized Expectations: WAS, Part III; Unrotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	1	.493	-.399	-.127	.257	.249	-.059	.148	-.225	.374
	2	.670	-.157	.179	-.236	.247	-.140	-.164	.207	.152
	3	.665	-.166	.326	-.272	-.001	.118	.001	.283	.018
	4	.149	-.689	-.057	.421	.054	-.218	-.056	.230	-.030
	5	.471	-.513	-.348	.117	-.204	-.102	.045	-.008	.137
Ep	6	.650	-.183	.233	-.097	.091	.179	-.074	-.108	.161
	7	.625	-.381	-.017	-.055	.323	-.053	.131	.127	-.095
	8	.691	-.110	-.227	-.087	-.016	.077	-.118	.173	.071
	9	.616	-.213	.165	-.092	-.148	-.054	.156	-.264	.029
	10	.643	-.225	.283	-.400	.083	-.085	-.044	.040	-.182
	11	.769	-.355	.129	-.047	-.102	.049	.044	-.081	-.175
	12	.563	.238	.154	.083	-.046	.446	-.001	-.406	.165
	1	.558	.120	.200	.414	-.268	-.262	.349	-.005	-.049
	2	.690	.034	-.006	.263	-.267	-.336	.007	-.120	.155
	3	.469	.525	-.168	.097	.222	.094	.007	.033	-.004
C1	4	.408	.529	-.324	.116	-.062	.026	.243	-.055	-.121
	5	.330	.477	-.302	-.406	-.126	-.346	.051	-.181	-.100
	6	.582	-.165	-.459	.191	.053	-.052	-.185	.049	-.400
	7	.627	.260	.250	.090	-.270	-.054	.311	.181	.095
	8	.474	.396	.219	.298	.157	.133	.047	.413	.149
	1	.563	.227	.053	.252	.367	.293	-.016	-.250	-.093
	2	.449	.198	-.033	.377	-.016	-.014	-.539	-.021	-.187
	3	.563	.250	-.047	-.197	.465	-.296	.049	-.190	-.252
C2	4	.447	.062	-.586	-.108	-.087	.425	.144	.212	.135
	5	.318	-.348	-.511	-.304	-.171	.124	-.033	.064	.094
	6	.074	.485	-.057	-.005	.080	-.287	-.389	.114	.488
	7	.417	-.196	.239	-.009	-.478	.179	-.429	-.113	-.156
	8	.306	.626	.094	.065	-.183	.071	.052	.336	-.252
	9	.468	.473	-.074	-.181	-.137	-.151	-.208	-.119	.194

TABLE 16

Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Teachers, WAS, Part I, Factor Solution

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percentage of Variance
1	10.046	34.64	34.64
2	2.719	9.38	44.02
3	1.802	6.21	50.23
4	1.428	4.93	55.16
5	1.364	4.70	59.86
6	1.184	4.08	63.94
7	1.121	3.87	67.81

TABLE 17

Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Teachers, WAS, Part II, Factor Solution

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percentage of Variance
1	11.582	39.94	39.94
2	2.686	9.26	49.20
3	1.787	6.16	55.36
4	1.463	5.04	60.40
5	1.295	4.47	64.87
6	1.111	3.83	68.70
7	1.008	3.47	72.17

TABLE 18

Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Teachers, WAS, Part III, Factor Solution

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percentage of Variance
1	8.239	28.41	28.41
2	3.633	12.53	40.94
3	1.803	6.21	47.15
4	1.530	5.28	52.43
5	1.308	4.51	56.94
6	1.194	4.12	61.06
7	1.131	3.90	64.96
8	1.085	3.74	68.70
9	1.056	3.64	72.34

Studies group obtained significantly higher loadings than the control group on the Principal Factor on all three parts.

Inasmuch as the subsequent factors consisted of both positive and negative loadings, the Fisher Exact Probability Test was used to analyze the independence of bi-polar dichotomies and group membership. These results are presented in Tables 22, 23, and 24. As can be noted, significant differences were obtained on each part: Part I, factors 2 and 7; Part II, factor 2; and Part III, factor 2.

Tables 25, 26, and 27 display these results symbolically. In these tables the differences in rank order for factor 1 can be easily noted from the differences in style of type; the similarities and differences among programs on the bi-polar factors can be noted by the relative numbers of + or - directions. Consequently, the dependent relationships which were obtained can be readily noted for factors 1, 2 and 7 on Part 1, factors 1 and 2 on Part II, and factors 1 and 2 on Part III.

text continues on page 69.

TABLE 19

Mann-Whitney U Test of Significance of the Difference Between the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part I

Group	n	Σ Ranks	U	Significance
Ep	12	253	29	$P < .002$
C	17	182		

TABLE 20

Mann-Whitney U Test of Significance of the Difference Between the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part II

Group	n	Σ Ranks	U	Significance
Ep	12	228	54	$P < .05$
C	17	207		

TABLE 21

Mann-Whitney U Test of Significance of the Difference Between the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part III

Group	n	Σ Ranks	U	Significance
Ep	12	240	42	$P < .02$
C	17	195		

TABLE 22

Fisher Exact Probability Test of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part I

Factor	Direction of Loadings	Number of Loadings Ep	C	Probability of Independence
2	+	4	13	$P < .05$
	-	8	4	
3	+	5	7	$P > .05$
	-	7	10	
4	+	6	8	$P > .05$
	-	6	9	
5	+	6	8	$P > .05$
	-	6	9	
6	+	9	9	$P > .05$
	-	3	8	
7	+	10	7	$P < .05$
	-	2	10	

TABLE 23

Fisher Exact Probability Tests of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep Group and C Groups (Teachers): WAS, Part II

Factor	Direction of Loadings	Number of Loadings		Probability of Independence
		Ep	C	
2	+	9	5	$P < .025$
	-	3	12	
3	+	3	10	$P > .05$
	-	9	7	
4	+	7	9	$P > .05$
	-	5	8	
5	+	6	10	$P > .05$
	-	6	7	
6	+	5	9	$P > .05$
	-	7	8	
7	+	6	12	$P > .05$
	-	6	5	

TABLE 24

Fisher Exact Probability Tests of
Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies
(+ or -) and Ep Group and C Groups
(Teachers): WAS, Part III

Factor	Direction of Loading	Number of Loadings Ep	C	Probability of Independence
2	+	1	14	$P < .005$
	-	11	3	
3	+	7	4	$P > .05$
	-	5	13	
4	+	4	8	$P > .05$
	-	8	9	
5	+	6	6	$P > .05$
	-	6	11	
6	+	5	6	$P > .05$
	-	7	11	
7	+	6	9	$P > .05$
	-	6	8	
8	+	6	7	$P > .05$
	-	6	10	
9	+	8	6	$P > .05$
	-	4	11	

TABLE 25

Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Directions of Factor Loadings for Unrotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors						
		1*	2**	3	4	5	6	7
Ep	8	**29**	--	-	+	+	-	+
	6	**28**	--	--	--	+	+	+
	12	**27**	--	-	+	--	-	-
	3	**26**	+	++	-	+	+	+
	9	**25**	--	-	-	-	+	--
	5	**24**	--	-	+	+	-	+
	11	**23**	-	-	+	--	+	+
	1	**21**	--	--	-	--	+	+
	4	**17**	--	+	+	++	+	+
	10	**15**	-	+	+	--	+	--
	7	*10*	+	++	--	-	+	+
	2	*8*	++	+	--	++	+	+
C1	16	**18**	-	-	+	+	-	-
	15	**16**	++	--	++	-	+	-
	18	*14*	+	-	++	++	+	++
	14	*12*	++	--	++	+	-	++
	13	*11*	++	+	++	++	--	-
	17	*5*	++	+	--	-	-	++
	19	*4*	++	-	-	+	+	-
	20	*2*	++	--	-	-	++	+
C2	27	**22**	--	+	-	++	+	-
	24	**20**	-	-	+	++	+	-
	21	**19**	-	-	-	--	--	+
	25	*13*	--	-	-	-	+	--
	23	*9*	++	+	-	--	--	-
	22	*7*	+	++	+	-	-	++
	28	*6*	++	++	-	-	+	+
	29	*3*	++	++	+	-	++	--
	26	*1*	++	--	--	++	--	-

*For factor 1, the reported variable is the rank order of the factor loading; high rank (i.e., 29) assigned to highest factor loading; bold type indicates rank of 15 or above.

**Directions of Bi-polar loading: ++high positive, + positive, - negative, --high negative.

TABLE 26

Teachers' Perceptions of Actual Expectations: WAS, Part II; Directions of Factor Loadings for Unrotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factor 1*	2**	3	4	5	6	7
Ep	11	**29**	+	-	-	-	-	-
	8	**28**	+	+	+	-	-	+
	6	**27**	-	-	+	-	-	-
	1	**26**	++	-	++	+	+	-
	9	**23**	++	-	-	-	-	+
	12	**20**	+	-	-	+	-	-
	7	**19**	-	-	+	-	+	++
	2	**18**	-	-	+	--	-	--
	3	*14*	+	--	-	+	--	+
	4	*11*	++	++	++	+	+	-
	10	*7*	+	--	--	++	+	+
	5	*6*	-	++	+	+	++	+
C1	16	**24**	+	++	-	-	+	-
	18	**21**	++	++	++	+	-	+
	19	**17**	--	+	--	+	-	-
	15	**15**	--	-	+	++	-	-
	14	*12*	--	+	+	+	-	+
	17	*10*	-	--	+	++	+	+
	13	*5*	-	++	-	++	+	+
	20	*2*	--	++	+	-	--	+
C2	22	**25**	-	+	+	+	-	+
	21	**22**	-	+	++	+	-	--
	24	**16**	+	++	--	--	+	+
	27	*13*	+	+	--	--	+	+
	25	*9*	+	--	--	+	-	+
	23	*8*	--	--	+	+	++	++
	29	*4*	--	-	-	+	++	++
	28	*3*	--	-	--	-	++	--
	26	*1*	--	-	++	--	+	+

*For factor 1, the reported variable is the rank order of the factor loading; high rank (i.e., 29) assigned to highest factor loading; bold type indicates rank of 15 or above.

**Directions of Bi-polar loading; ++high positive + positive, - negative, --high negative.

TABLE 27

Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part III; Directions of Factor Loadings for Unrotated Factor Solutions

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors								
		1*	2**	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Ep	11	**29**	--	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
	8	**28**	-	--	-	-	+	-	+	+
	2	**26**	-	+	--	++	-	-	+	+
	3	**25**	-	++	--	-	+	+	++	+
	6	**24**	-	++	-	+	+	-	-	+
	10	**23**	--	++	--	+	-	-	+	-
	7	**21**	--	-	-	++	-	+	+	-
	9	**20**	-	+	-	-	-	+	--	+
	12	**16**	++	+	+	++	++	-	--	+
	1	*14*	--	-	++	++	-	+	--	++
	5	*12*	--	--	+	-	-	+	-	+
	4	*2*	--	-	++	+	-	-	++	-
C1	14	**27**	+	-	++	--	--	+	-	+
	19	**22**	++	++	-	--	-	++	+	+
	18	**19**	-	--	+	+	-	-	+	--
	13	**15**	+	+	++	--	--	++	-	-
	20	*13*	++	+	++	+	+	+	++	+
	15	*11*	++	-	+	++	+	+	+	-
	16	*6*	++	--	+	-	+	++	-	-
	17	*5*	++	--	--	-	--	+	-	-
C2	21	**18**	++	+	++	++	++	-	--	-
	23	**17**	++	-	-	++	--	+	-	--
	29	*10*	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
	22	*9*	+	-	++	-	-	--	-	-
	24	*8*	+	--	-	-	++	+	+	+
	27	*7*	-	++	-	--	+	--	--	--
	25	*4*	--	--	--	-	+	-	+	+
	28	*3*	++	+	+	-	+	+	++	--
	26	*1*	++	-	-	+	--	--	+	++

*For factor 1, the reported variable is the rank order of the factor loading; high rank (i.e., 29) assigned to highest factor loading; bold type indicates rank of 15 or above.

**Directions of Bi-polar loading: ++ high positive, + positive, - negative, -- high negative.

In order to complete this series of analyses, the responses of individual teachers were compared for the identification of the factors. This process involved first the comparisons of the item responses for respondents who obtained similar extreme factor loadings; and, second, the comparisons of item responses for respondents who obtained opposite (or dissimilar) factor loadings. This enabled the investigators to isolate for a given factor those items which clustered around that factor. The items so identified are presented in Tables 28, 29, and 30. The entries in the tables indicate the response direction (*i.e.*, A *vs.* E) associated with positive loadings on the factors. For factor 1, both the common item directions and the differentiating item directions are listed. The former are indicated in Item letter type and the latter in Standard type. These responses can be matched with the items on the WAS for factor identification. These item clusters will be examined and interpreted in the Interpretation of Findings section of this report.

Up to this point, the discussion has been centered on the unrotated factor solutions. These original solutions were used for the primary analyses because of the bi-polar nature of all but the Principal Factors. However, in an attempt to obtain an optimum solution the original factor matrices were rotated. Analyses of these rotated solutions were handicapped because of the de-emphasis of the bi-polar characteristics which were evident in the former solution.

The significant factor loadings for the rotated solutions for Parts I, II, and III are presented in Tables 54, 55, and 56, respectively. These tables are presented in Appendix D.

text continues on page 79.

TABLE 28

Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part I, Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations

	Factors						
Item No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	A						
2	A						
3		E					
4	A						
5	A						
6		E					
7					A		
8	A						
9							
10		A					
11							A
12			E				
13	A						
14	A						
15			A				
16	E						
17	A						
18		A					
19				E			
20	A						
21	A						
22	A						
23		E					

TABLE 28 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24				E			
25	A						
26		E					
27		E					
28			E				
29					A		
30		E					
31		A					
32	A						
33				E			
34		A					
35	A						
36	E						
37	A						
38	E						
39	A						
40				A			
41					A		
42		E					
43			E				
44		E					
45		E					
46							A
47		E					
48						A	

TABLE 28 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49	A						
50	A						
51	A						
52	A						
53	A						
54	A						
55	A						
56	E						
57	A						
58	A						
59		E					
60	A						
61	A						
62			E				
63			E				
64			E				
65							A
66	E						
67	A						
68			E				
69			E				
70						E	
71			E				

Item letter type -- items on factor 1 that were answered similarly by all respondents.
Standard type -- items that differentiate between high and low (+ or -) factor loadings.
Letter (A or E) -- indicates direction of response associated with positive loadings on the factors.

TABLE 29

Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part II, Teachers' Perceptions of Actual Expectations

Item No.	Factors						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (unidentified)
72		E					
73			E				
74							
75			E				
76	A						
77	A						
78		A					
79	A						
80			E				
81	A						
82	A						
83		E					
84	A						
85	A						
86	A						
87			A				
88	A						
89				E			
90							
91							
92	A						
93	A						

TABLE 29 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (unidentified)
94							
95				E			
96							
97							
98							
99				E			
100			A				
101						E	
102		E					
103	A						
104	A						
105		E					
106	A						
107		E					
108						A	
109						A	
110	A						
111		E					
112	A						
113				A			
114				E			
115	A						
116	A						
117					A		
118					A		

TABLE 29 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (unidentified)
119	A						
120	A						
121	A						
122	A						
123	A						
124	A						
125	A						
126	A						
127	A						
128	A						
129	A						
130							
131	A						
132	A						
133							
134				A			
135							
136	A						
137							
138	A						
139	A						
140	A						
141			E				
142	A						

Item letter type -- items on factor 1 that were answered similarly by all respondents.
Standard type -- items that differentiate between high and low (+ or -) factor loadings.
Letter (A or E) -- indicates direction of response associated with positive loadings on the factors.

TABLE 30

Items Associated with Nine Unrotated Factors; Part III, Teachers' Perceptions of Realized Expectations

Item No.	Factors								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
							(	unidentified	)
143	A								
144		E							
145					E				
146						A			
147				E					
148									
149					E				
150	A								
151		E							
152									
153									
154			A						
155		E							
156									
157	A								
158	E								
159	A								
160									
161									
162	A								
163									
164									
165	A								

TABLE 30 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (	8 unidentified	9)
166									
167	A								
168		E							
169		E							
170		A							
171		E							
172			A						
173			A						
174	A								
175		E							
176									
177		E							
178									
179			E						
180	E								
181	A								
182		A							
183	A								
184					A				
185				E					
186	A								
187	A								
188					A				
189	A								

TABLE 30 (continued)

Item No.	Factors								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
							(	unidentified	)
190					A				
191	A								
192									
193	A								
194									
195									
196	A								
197	A								
198	A								
199									
200									
201	A								
202									
203	A								
204			E						
205				E					
206									
207						A			
208									
209									
210									
211				A					
212				E					
213									

Item letter type -- items on factor 1 that were answered similarly by all respondents.
Standard type -- items that differentiate between high and low (+ or -) factor loadings.
Letter (A or E) -- indicates direction of response associated with positive loadings on the factors.

The general results obtained from the utilization of the rotated solution were consistent with those obtained through the original solution. However, the factors associated with the rotated solutions were not as clearly identifiable in that some item overlap was noted. Therefore, further interpretation for these data is confined to the original factor solutions.

Students' Perceptions. The inventory was administered to the students in the three programs. As was previously indicated, the students' responses to the WAS were analyzed using Principal Axis Factor Analysis (Q-technique). Due to process limitations, the factor analyses had to be limited to a sample of 90 respondents, 30 from each school. This sample was selected at random from the total population of respondents with the restriction that students representing each teacher, or teacher-team, would be included in the sample.

Application of the Q-technique, as already described, yields factor solutions for students' responses on the three parts of the WAS: Part I, Explicit Expectations; Part II, Actual Expectations; and Part III, Realized Expectations. The first seven factors of the solutions are presented in Tables 31, 32, and 33, respectively. The factor solutions consisted of 22 factors. Of these, the first 7 factors accounted for the major portion of the accountable variation; beyond these, the individual factors accounted for only small amounts of variation and were therefore discarded. The Eigenvalues and percentages of variance accounted for by the factors in the three parts are presented in Tables 34, 35, and 36.

Tests of significance were applied to the factor solutions to determine whether or not the directions of factor loadings were independent of membership in the experimental and control groups. Since the sample size was sufficiently large, the control groups retained their separate identities for these analyses. Therefore, Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of

Variance tests were used to determine the significance of the differences among the groups on the Principal factors. (This test was based on the rank order of factor loadings with the first factor assigned to the lowest factor loading.) The results for these tests are presented in Tables 37, 38, and 39. As can be noted in the Tables, the analyses were significant for all three parts, with C2 obtaining the higher factor loadings on all parts. Ep and C1 obtained about the same loadings on Parts I and II, and Ep obtained the lowest loadings on Part III.

Inasmuch as there are three groups and the subsequent factors consisted of both positive and negative loadings, the Chi-Square Test of Independence was applied to determine the relation between the bi-polar dichotomies and group membership. The results are presented in Tables 40, 41, and 42. Significant differences were found on each part of the WAS: Part I, factors 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7; Part II, factors 2, 4, and 5; and Part III, factors 2, 3, 5, and 7. It is interesting that for Part II, factors 4 and 5, and for Part III, factor 3, the significance was between the two control groups.

Completing this series of analyses, the responses of the students were compared in order to identify the factors which accounted for most of the variance. As was done with the teachers' responses, comparisons were made first of the item responses for respondents who obtained extreme factor loadings in the same direction; second, comparisons were made of item responses for those respondents who obtained high factor loadings in opposite (or dissimilar) directions. In that manner, the items from the WAS which seemed to form the clusters making up the factors were identified. The items isolated in this manner are presented in Tables 43, 44, and 45. The direction of the responses (*i.e.*, A *vs.* E) associated with positive loadings for the factors are indicated. Once more, the differing type faces refer to items which tended to receive commonality of responses from all the groups and to an item cluster which discriminated between the groups. The responses so identified can be matched with specific items on the WAS for factor identification. These item clusters will be examined and interpreted in the Interpretation of Findings section of this report.

Finally, a rotated factor solution was found for these data. The solution characteristics were similar to the rotated solution as applied to the data for the teachers' responses. Therefore, interpretation of these data is confined to the unrotated factor solution. The significant factor loadings for the rotated solutions are presented in Tables 57, 58, and 59, in the Appendix E.

Congruence. Several of the research questions posed in this investigation were concerned with congruence of teacher-student and explicit-actual-realized expectations. These data are not presented in this report due to unforeseen delays in data processing. The writers expect to present these data as an addendum to this report when the output becomes available from the computer center.

text continues on page 108.

TABLE 31

Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Unrotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Students)		Factors						
	No.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ep	1	37	.549	-.258	-.332	-.065	-.086	.027	.061
	2	15	.468	-.393	-.203	.413	.189	.274	.042
	3	3	.371	.086	-.020	.039	-.072	.261	.239
	4	70	.673	.247	-.027	-.056	.007	.201	.155
	5	38.5	.550	-.464	.199	-.365	.121	.023	.093
	6	86	.744	-.202	-.160	-.103	.010	.076	.135
	7	49	.585	-.356	.002	.266	-.076	-.077	.107
	8	69	.672	-.143	.269	-.045	.216	.167	.184
	9	11	.445	.078	-.204	-.043	.447	.203	.089
	10	7	.416	.459	.092	-.051	.311	-.181	-.131
	11	42	.559	-.428	-.013	.145	-.195	.076	.090
	12	58.5	.635	-.236	.021	-.272	-.213	.086	.076
	13	33.5	.540	-.504	.020	.139	.008	-.270	-.070
	14	30	.537	-.529	-.023	.012	.013	.047	.045
	15	47	.581	-.420	-.067	.030	-.011	-.354	.054
	16	32	.539	.038	-.503	.221	.104	.145	.118
	17	16	.474	-.633	-.152	.025	-.135	.098	.138
	18	50	.590	-.353	.327	.337	-.078	.041	.051
	19	33.5	.540	-.434	-.327	.061	-.160	-.113	-.253
	20	25.5	.523	-.453	-.449	-.043	-.045	.069	.206
	21	65.5	.662	-.265	-.007	.015	-.114	.072	.015
	22	71.5	.674	-.046	.010	.102	-.040	.037	.229
	23	46	.580	-.561	.090	.026	-.113	-.198	.018
	24	17	.482	-.627	.138	.104	.104	.057	.226
	25	88	.792	-.122	-.094	-.195	.004	.168	.216
	26	73	.676	-.218	-.117	-.215	-.205	.097	-.038
	27	14	.453	.008	-.214	.144	.322	-.111	.021
	28	43	.564	-.091	.159	.009	-.419	.139	-.031
	29	38.5	.550	-.100	-.085	-.247	-.131	-.200	.316
	30	65.5	.662	-.228	-.073	.008	.040	.204	.172

TABLE 31 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students)		Factors						
	No.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C1	31	30	.537	-.329	.201	.009	.258	.104	.039
	32	83.5	.719	-.025	-.064	-.279	-.048	.059	.011
	33	12	.445	-.028	.140	-.284	-.048	-.078	-.101
	34	23	.516	.063	.431	-.069	-.091	.229	.250
	35	87	.751	.138	-.009	-.118	-.014	.226	.016
	36	82	.712	.190	.355	.159	.264	.105	.101
	37	35.5	.543	.011	.269	.087	.032	-.018	.092
	38	4	.376	.059	.151	.180	.088	-.391	-.354
	39	22	.514	-.205	.340	.148	-.288	-.081	-.170
	40	20	.512	-.147	.279	-.109	-.122	-.353	.121
	41	9	.441	.197	-.073	-.237	-.384	.186	-.390
	42	19	.494	.224	.012	-.034	.148	.245	.010
	43	45	.572	.056	.145	-.105	.232	.184	-.362
	44	8	.438	.001	.051	-.017	.089	-.290	-.088
	45	1	.355	.118	-.032	-.302	.269	-.110	.100
	46	55	.622	-.102	.189	.029	.053	.306	.081
	47	71.5	.674	-.049	.033	-.149	-.031	.014	-.037
	48	2	.364	.089	.113	-.127	-.049	.015	-.313
	49	24	.519	.220	.063	-.260	.094	.294	.321
	50	28	.531	-.062	-.159	.333	-.102	-.399	-.191
	51	40	.555	.345	-.190	-.314	-.056	-.053	.022
	52	67.5	.671	-.149	.160	.141	.182	-.099	-.182
	53	67.5	.671	.099	.077	.105	-.167	.150	-.065
	54	10	.443	.006	-.220	-.001	.298	.187	-.435
	55	13	.450	-.286	.285	-.200	.023	-.137	.333
	56	54	.613	.138	.071	-.038	.055	-.120	-.095
	57	61	.637	-.183	.122	-.214	.195	-.032	-.047
	58	52	.602	.342	.149	-.074	-.131	.143	-.201
	59	27	.527	-.106	.169	-.137	-.281	.149	-.123
	60	35.5	.544	-.137	.241	-.181	.319	-.182	-.106

TABLE 31 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students)		Factors						
	No.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C2	61	6	.414	-.393	-.232	-.324	-.077	-.033	-.120
	62	78	.688	.495	-.144	.056	-.033	-.106	.057
	63	64	.661	.332	.192	-.076	.107	.033	-.014
	64	25.5	.523	-.246	-.495	.034	.204	.071	-.188
	65	80	.690	.547	.016	.013	-.067	.057	-.057
	66	81	.699	.360	-.074	-.079	-.192	-.109	-.009
	67	44	.566	-.110	.458	.008	-.110	-.018	-.021
	68	58.5	.635	.132	-.021	.122	-.306	.109	.077
	69	53	.604	.047	.135	.540	.103	-.006	-.037
	70	21	-.513	-.112	-.240	-.133	-.060	.114	-.205
	71	75.5	.685	-.305	.094	.166	.077	-.013	.053
	72	75.5	.685	.393	-.102	-.009	-.030	-.225	.222
	73	5	.386	.106	.113	-.122	.583	-.153	-.032
	74	18	.488	.075	-.097	.201	-.152	.096	-.300
	75	61	.637	.034	-.130	-.258	.100	-.186	-.106
	76	83.5	.719	.330	.160	-.031	-.007	-.045	-.037
	77	30	.537	.263	-.411	.167	-.071	-.140	.199
	78	41	.556	.397	-.038	-.081	.175	-.060	.214
	79	61	.637	.228	-.276	-.034	.112	-.239	-.020
	80	90	.801	.100	.044	.157	.066	-.117	-.001
	81	89	.799	.265	-.120	.008	-.113	-.104	.035
	82	77	.686	.066	.168	.356	.122	.143	-.055
	83	48	.583	.429	-.247	-.031	-.047	.011	.014
	84	51	.596	.274	.038	.502	.062	-.006	-.049
	85	79	.689	.446	.065	.113	.056	-.141	.042
	86	57	.626	.342	-.159	.124	-.245	-.269	.036
	87	85	.722	.370	-.062	-.261	.075	-.104	.190
	88	63	.655	.190	.156	.163	-.100	.022	-.083
	89	56	.625	.435	.032	.104	-.191	.068	.062
	90	74	.680	.072	.026	.237	.012	-.135	-.103

TABLE 32

Students' Perceptions of Actual Expectations: WAS, Part II; Unrotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Students) No.	Rank	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ep	1	29	.216	.072	-.113	-.011	-.033	.012	.037
	2	8	.019	.336	.083	.131	.016	.008	.019
	3	9	.026	.098	-.130	.104	-.825	.092	.009
	4	67.5	.498	.189	-.160	.422	-.282	.129	.158
	5	17	.114	.356	.105	.123	.031	.054	.139
	6	67.5	.498	.109	-.105	-.063	-.213	-.059	-.319
	7	27	.211	.605	.049	.306	-.043	-.102	.075
	8	12	.081	.238	.024	.273	-.366	.172	-.168
	9	45.5	.301	.084	-.078	.116	.175	-.028	-.009
	10	3	-.139	.414	-.341	.154	.041	.109	-.022
	11	30.5	.218	.753	-.080	-.071	-.239	.222	-.034
	12	44	.289	.396	.092	-.004	-.367	.207	.021
	13	19	.129	.387	.072	.137	-.098	-.046	-.072
	14	7	.015	.823	-.042	.089	.055	.059	-.017
	15	51	.367	-.032	-.220	.048	-.055	.006	-.256
	16	26	.206	.143	.089	.354	-.119	.050	.150
	17	14	.091	.319	-.013	.061	-.995	.161	.066
	18	20	.132	.368	.067	.371	-.145	.582	.112
	19	2	-.176	.478	.070	.132	-.102	-.001	.125
	20	15	.098	.480	-.339	-.096	-.068	.070	-.206
	21	52	.376	.270	-.037	-.019	-.140	.619	-.114
	22	58	.416	-.094	-.081	.117	.067	.115	.133
	23	11	.044	.614	.049	.177	-.018	.230	.176
	24	1	-.186	.354	-.249	-.003	-.317	.040	-.059
	25	79	.632	.142	-.058	-.093	-.196	.157	.009
	26	16	.109	.222	.039	.069	.107	.235	-.014
	27	5	-.019	-.083	-.045	-.025	.468	.019	.451
	28	56	.393	-.012	.023	.283	-.311	.004	.055
	29	74	.552	.286	.149	.010	-.122	.142	.257
	30	10	.032	.322	-.178	.092	-.002	-.171	.007

TABLE 32 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students)		Factors						
	No.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C1	31	6	.015	.340	-.102	.030	.132	.064	.061
	32	75	.556	-.102	.030	-.061	-.157	.266	.009
	33	24	.196	-.017	-.107	.099	.013	.100	.815
	34	61	.452	.083	-.039	-.066	-.180	-.214	.202
	35	65	.491	-.112	.002	-.068	-.329	.168	.196
	36	76	.581	.381	.065	-.034	-.197	.100	.207
	37	63	.477	.265	.061	.110	.058	-.047	.337
	38	34	.225	-.099	.130	-.124	-.030	.099	.064
	39	13	.086	.158	-.052	.145	-.297	.493	.305
	40	62	.457	.315	.054	.050	-.077	-.073	.270
	41	33	.222	.006	-.786	.109	-.176	-.099	.136
	42	60	.448	.070	-.114	.415	-.481	.278	.048
	43	50	.348	.322	-.034	-.116	-.125	.521	.224
	44	36	.236	.070	-.024	.139	-.166	-.029	-.034
	45	22	.175	.092	.026	.184	-.203	-.106	.040
	46	32	.220	.342	.093	-.208	-.341	-.102	.012
	47	69.5	.520	.074	.018	.037	-.180	.155	.025
	48	35	.227	.092	-.107	-.023	-.040	.029	.012
	49	43	.284	.064	.035	.168	-.005	.834	.080
	50	40	.271	.148	-.155	.056	-.244	-.084	.070
	51	85	.739	-.053	-.069	-.203	-.142	.077	.096
	52	57	.408	.500	-.052	.139	-.062	.194	.093
	53	71	.533	.130	-.017	.013	.235	.295	.008
	54	54	.383	-.053	-.293	.065	.038	-.022	.320
	55	39	.254	.391	-.090	.183	-.208	-.001	.106
	56	48	.330	.044	-.135	-.028	-.400	.306	-.017
	57	25	.199	.245	.022	-.001	-.355	.205	.098
	58	42	.276	.256	-.017	.048	-.338	.100	.494
	59	41	.273	.396	.001	.111	-.176	.209	-.042
	60	30.5	.218	.188	-.052	.117	-.238	.174	.182

TABLE 32 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students)		Factors						
	No.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C2	61	4	-.042	.177	-.249	-.145	-.007	-.007	.019
	62	86	.772	.016	-.056	.109	-.095	.068	.038
	63	73	.545	.138	-.277	.225	-.001	.130	-.025
	64	18	.122	.202	.073	.077	.062	-.104	.029
	65	87	.809	.021	-.144	.057	.049	.112	.027
	66	72	.544	.240	-.052	.190	.223	.104	.141
	67	45.5	.301	.270	.152	.206	-.124	.463	.001
	68	66	.492	.148	-.460	-.087	.099	.198	.074
	69	47	.321	.254	-.082	.675	-.025	.151	.100
	70	21	.155	.141	-.122	-.005	.085	.052	.063
	71	89	.826	.223	.025	.168	.065	-.105	.088
	72	28	.212	.240	-.067	.008	-.163	.091	.033
	73	69.5	.520	-.084	-.192	-.073	-.068	.132	.241
	74	38	.249	.132	-.099	.028	-.234	.142	.057
	75	53	.379	.405	-.056	.122	-.184	.131	-.157
	76	82	.690	.089	.002	.110	-.052	.134	.003
	77	80	.679	.119	.133	.264	-.110	.166	.176
	78	83	.695	-.043	.062	.307	.007	.073	.117
	79	76	.581	.121	-.341	.184	-.093	.232	-.208
	80	64	.481	.347	-.194	.281	.030	.242	.009
	81	84	.716	.214	-.118	.268	.067	.141	-.041
	82	49	.337	.461	-.116	.067	-.092	-.053	-.008
	83	78	.604	.030	-.304	.166	-.041	.090	-.034
	84	37	.237	.220	-.041	.308	.031	.228	.124
	85	88	.812	.088	-.098	.024	-.084	.151	.023
	86	55	.389	.037	-.066	.671	-.129	.139	.046
	87	90	.832	.036	.073	.064	-.018	.136	-.009
	88	23	.192	.071	-.103	.029	.045	.061	.008
	89	81	.685	.058	-.146	.289	-.174	.013	.183
	90	59	.429	.241	-.309	.202	-.220	-.039	.133

TABLE 33

Students' Perceptions of Realized Expectations: WAS, Part III; Unrotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Students)		Factors						
	No.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
EP	1	20	.467	.274	-.266	.237	-.227	.032	-.066
	2	6	.345	.447	.377	.103	-.053	.035	.045
	3	3	.325	.304	-.209	.405	.006	.300	-.031
	4	85	.763	-.042	.188	-.020	.193	-.202	.091
	5	44	.590	.327	-.169	-.200	.179	-.127	-.142
	6	32	.543	-.095	-.117	-.435	.033	.088	.304
	7	86	-.785	.180	.087	-.013	-.138	-.098	-.116
	8	25	.514	.423	.105	.215	-.105	-.292	-.031
	9	61	.665	.009	.044	.205	-.183	.049	.037
	10	2	.309	.165	-.067	.564	-.045	.030	.002
	11	5	.336	.366	.154	.020	-.320	.255	-.214
	12	4	.761	-.023	-.205	-.001	.016	-.053	.105
	13	3	.710	-.400	-.162	.077	.053	-.010	.021
	14	11.5	.402	.641	.055	-.238	.167	-.014	.132
	15	88	.796	-.047	-.151	.064	-.025	.217	-.081
	16	45	.591	-.230	.197	.375	-.031	.014	.227
	17	31	.538	.269	.073	-.002	-.038	-.237	.372
	18	28	.529	.148	.304	.386	.225	-.396	.036
	19	4	.328	.638	.146	-.249	-.186	-.037	.077
	20	39	.575	.155	-.267	-.145	.062	-.198	-.064
	21	55	.655	-.074	.023	.193	-.048	-.157	.100
	22	59.5	.663	-.180	-.092	-.090	-.061	-.158	.150
	23	59.5	.663	.101	.024	.334	-.105	.118	.104
	24	26	.525	.421	-.143	.031	-.223	.007	.256
	25	69	.696	.256	.136	.273	-.068	.032	.063
	26	27	.527	.152	-.244	-.238	.080	.067	.316
	27	58	.664	.108	.089	.106	-.153	-.034	.068
	28	19	.462	-.020	.107	-.472	-.324	.145	.093
	29	23	.494	.179	.130	.107	-.115	-.294	.292
	30	52	.648	-.158	-.234	.148	-.161	-.222	-.094

TABLE 33 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students) No.	Rank	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C1	31	41	.583	.294	-.036	.066	.122	-.063	-.125
	32	67	.692	-.306	-.438	.134	.066	-.100	-.035
	33	7	.349	-.122	-.113	.097	.330	.451	-.071
	34	22	.477	.047	-.384	-.179	-.189	-.104	.199
	35	80	.753	-.229	-.142	-.139	.285	-.112	.120
	36	53	.652	.122	-.013	.147	-.019	.037	.014
	37	24	.496	.206	-.388	.127	.094	.144	-.103
	38	10	.385	-.026	.126	-.442	-.266	.138	.168
	39	8	.363	.075	.208	-.083	.612	.110	.086
	40	30	.537	.107	.233	-.284	.169	.245	-.171
	41	43	.586	-.008	-.337	.028	-.068	.045	.093
	42	37	.565	.140	.078	-.115	.086	.143	-.132
	43	66	.677	.146	-.160	-.178	.193	-.224	-.119
	44	16	.436	-.063	-.078	.044	-.008	.159	.399
	45	38	.569	.010	.033	.008	-.150	-.116	-.082
	46	68	.693	-.071	-.095	-.238	-.173	.093	.039
	47	62	.666	-.221	-.247	.123	-.125	.059	.034
	48	21	.473	-.006	.016	.120	-.138	.224	.118
	49	48	.618	-.187	-.171	.054	.147	-.250	-.007
	50	54	.653	.002	-.081	.108	-.043	-.070	-.259
	51	78	.734	-.345	-.099	-.075	.165	.050	-.032
	52	64	.670	.255	.095	.129	.079	-.206	-.064
	53	63	.668	-.054	-.204	-.068	.082	-.061	.085
	54	65	.675	-.054	-.262	.150	.103	.196	-.029
	55	17	.439	.280	.235	-.023	.037	.182	-.337
	56	33	.547	.220	.231	.052	.255	.071	.250
	57	49	.632	-.135	-.173	-.026	.283	.023	-.049
	58	42	.584	.201	.115	.130	.243	-.177	-.118
	59	29	.435	.378	-.070	-.198	.241	-.303	-.137
	60	13	.413	.408	-.146	-.069	.277	.001	-.270

TABLE 33 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students) No.	Rank	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C2	61	1	.276	.546	-.369	.031	-.230	.191	-.007
	62	83	.756	-.331	.251	.100	-.086	-.017	-.012
	63	89	-.805	-.132	-.066	.097	-.082	.091	.146
	64	11.5	.402	.264	-.244	-.148	-.535	-.155	-.135
	65	75	.712	-.411	.043	-.242	.033	-.062	-.086
	66	51	.636	-.254	.315	.000	.006	.028	-.046
	67	14	.416	.400	.050	-.243	.185	.129	.242
	68	47	.614	-.242	.221	-.039	-.132	-.080	-.005
	69	36	.561	-.007	.583	-.020	-.105	-.013	-.015
	70	35	.554	.058	.105	.176	.290	.237	-.074
	71	2	.755	-.126	.170	-.050	-.123	-.034	-.186
	72	76	.718	-.219	.005	.100	-.176	-.134	.008
	73	34	.548	-.011	-.208	-.110	-.050	.273	-.178
	74	18	.441	-.148	-.233	.005	.044	.249	.212
	75	50	.634	.147	-.091	-.096	.150	.005	-.253
	76	70	.698	-.071	-.099	-.194	-.069	-.085	-.255
	77	71	.700	-.189	.061	-.010	-.122	-.029	-.056
	78	75	.716	-.359	.010	.021	-.062	-.098	-.126
	79	79	.743	.032	.124	.028	.110	.040	.413
	80	46	.595	.242	.217	-.017	.098	.073	-.246
	81	81	.754	-.191	-.005	-.204	-.240	.007	-.106
	82	40	.577	-.141	.184	.172	-.055	.095	.099
	83	56	.658	-.342	.263	-.289	-.007	.068	-.005
	84	57	.660	-.153	-.149	.128	-.104	-.053	-.276
	85	72	.706	-.176	.157	-.179	.055	.064	.020
	86	29	.535	-.073	.507	-.116	-.089	.105	-.068
	87	87	.793	-.184	.023	-.183	.047	.013	-.100
	88	9	.370	.157	.089	-.107	-.057	.409	-.039
	89	77	.731	-.260	.269	.085	-.068	.129	-.116
	90	90	.834	-.095	.123	.186	-.055	.033	-.085

TABLE 34

Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Students, WAS, Part I, Factor Solution

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percentage of Variance
1	31.276	34.75	34.75
2	7.262	8.07	42.82
3	3.418	3.80	46.62
4	3.026	3.36	49.98
5	2.718	3.02	53.00
6	2.358	2.62	55.62
7	2.272	2.56	58.14

TABLE 35

Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Students, WAS, Part II, Factor Solution

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percentage of Variance
1	27.678	30.75	30.75
2	7.193	8.00	38.75
3	3.600	3.99	42.74
4	3.303	3.68	46.42
5	2.872	3.19	49.61
6	2.647	2.94	52.55
7	2.352	2.61	55.16

TABLE 36

Eigenvalues and Percentages Associated with the Factors for the Students, WAS, Part III, Factor Solution

1	32.660	36.29	36.29
2	5.189	5.76	42.05
3	3.588	3.99	46.04
4	3.099	3.44	49.48
5	2.654	2.95	52.43
6	2.334	2.60	55.03
7	2.225	2.47	57.50

TABLE 37

Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance of the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep, C1, and C2 (Students): WAS, Part I

Group	n	Σ Ranks	H	df	Significance
Ep	30	1275.5	10.54	2	$P < .01$
C1	30	1089.0			
C2	30	1730.5			

TABLE 38

Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance of the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep, C1, and C2 (Students): WAS, Part II

Group	n	Σ Ranks	H	df	Significance
Ep	30	1220.5	7.22	2	$P < .01$
C1	30	1248.0			
C2	30	1640.5			

TABLE 39

Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance of the Magnitudes of Principal-Factor Loadings for Ep, C1, and C2 (Students): WAS, Part III

Group	n	Σ Ranks	H	df	Significance
Ep	30	846.0	19.40	2	$P < .01$
C1	30	1392.0			
C2	30	1826.0			

TABLE 40

Chi-Square Test of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep, C1, and C2 Groups (Students): WAS, Part I

Factor	Direction of Loadings	Number of Loadings Ep	 C1	 C2	χ^2	Probability of Independence
2	+	5	17	26	29.73	$P < .05$
	-	25	13	4		
3	+	10	22	13	10.40	$P < .05$
	-	20	8	17		
4	+	18	8	18	8.90	$P < .05$
	-	12	22	12		
5	+	13	15	14	0.27	$P > .05$
	-	17	15	16		
6	+	22	16	10	9.64	$P < .05$
	-	8	14	20		
7	+	24	11	12	13.98	$P < .05$
	-	6	19	18		

TABLE 41

Chi-Square Test of Independence of
Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and
Ep, C1, and C2 Groups (Students):
WAS, Part II

Factor	Direction of Loadings	Number of Loadings Ep	C1	C2	χ^2	Probability of Independence
2	+	20	14	10	6.76	$P < .05$
	-	10	16	20		
3	+	15	14	12	0.63	$P > .05$
	-	15	16	18		
4	+	20	6	23	22.13	$P < .05$
	-	10	24	7		
5	+	15	8	19	8.30	$P < .05$
	-	15	22	11		
6	+	15	12	17	1.69	$P > .05$
	-	15	18	13		
7	+	14	17	13	1.16	$P > .05$
	-	16	13	17		

TABLE 42

Chi-Square Test of Independence of Bi-polar Dichotomies (+ or -) and Ep, C1, and C2 Groups (Students): WAS, Part III

Factor	Direction of Loadings	Number of Loadings			χ^2	Probability of Independence
		Ep	C1	C2		
2	+	20	15	8	9.71	$P < .05$
	-	10	15	22		
3	+	17	9	21	9.98	$P < .05$
	-	13	21	9		
4	+	18	14	12	2.49	$P > .05$
	-	12	16	18		
5	+	10	21	10	10.84	$P < .05$
	-	20	9	20		
6	+	14	17	19	1.71	$P > .05$
	-	16	13	11		
7	+	21	12	8	11.92	$P < .05$
	-	9	18	22		

TABLE 43

Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part I, Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations

Item No.	Factors						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (unidentified)
1	A						
2		E					
3	A						
4							
5					A		
6				A			
7			E				
8							
9		E					
10	A						
11	A						
12		A					
13	A						
14							
15			E				
16		A					
17							
18			A				
19			E				
20							
21					E		
22		E					

TABLE 43 (continued)

Item No.	Factors						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (unidentified)
23	E						
24							
25		E					
26						A	
27							
28		A					
29			E				
30						A	
31							
32					E		
33			E				
34	A						
35							
36							
37							
38		A					
39				A			
40		A					
41	E						
42	E						
43							
44							
45						A	
46		E					
47	E						

TABLE 43 (continued)

	Factors						
Item No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (unidentified)
48				A			
49							
50		E					
51			E				
52		E					
53		E					
54		E					
55							
56					E		
57	E						
58							
59							
60					E		
61	E						
62	E						
63			E				
64				A			
65	E						
66	E						
67				A			
68				A			
69							
70							
71	A						

Item letter type -- items on factor 1 that were answered similarly by all respondents.
Standard type -- items that differentiate between high and low (+ or -) factor loadings.
Letter (A or E) -- indicates direction of response associated with positive loadings on the factors.

TABLE 44

Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part II, Students' Perceptions of Actual Expectations

Item No.	Factors						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
72	A						
73				E			
74							E
75		A					
76	A						
77	E						
78					E		
79	A						
80	E						
81							
82	E						
83							
84	A						
85							
86		A					
87				A			
88							
89	A						
90	E						
91							
92	A						
93	E						

TABLE 44 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
94			A				
95							
96	A						
97	E						
98	E						
99	A						
100	E						
101							
102			A				
103			A				
104		A					
105							
106							
107							
108							
109	A						
110	E						
111		E					
112							
113						E	
114							
115							
116							
117							

TABLE 44 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
118	E						
119	E						
120							
121				A			
122		A					
123		A					
124		A					
125		A					
126	E						
127							
128		A					
129	E						
130		A					
131		A					
132		A					
133				A			
134	E						
135							
136							A
137							
138							A
139							
140							

TABLE 44 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
141			E				
142							

Item letter type -- items on factor 1 that were answered similarly by all respondents.
Standard type -- items that differentiate between high and low (+ or -) factor loadings.
Letter (A or E) -- indicates direction of response associated with positive loadings on the factors.

TABLE 45

Items Associated with Seven Unrotated Factors; Part III, Students' Perceptions of Realized Expectations

	Factors						
Item No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
143							
144							A
145	E						
146		A					
147							
148				E			
149	E						
150							
151			A				
152							
153							
154				E			
155							
156	E						
157		A					
158				E			
159		A					
160	A						
161	E						
162			E				
163							
164			E				

TABLE 45 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
165	E						
166							
167							A
168			A				
169							
170							
171							
172	A						
173			A				
174			A				
175				E			
176			A				
177		A					
178							
179						E	
180							
181						E	
182						A	
183						E	
184							E
185							
186							
187		A					
188	E						
189	E						

TABLE 45 (continued)

	Factors						
Item No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
190	E						
191	E						
192					E		
193					E		
194	A						
195							
196					E		
197							
198							
199					A		
200					E		
201				E			
202	A						
203							
204							
205		A					
206	E						
207							
208						A	
209		A					
210							
211							
212				A			

TABLE 45 (continued)

Item No.	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
213				E			

Item letter type -- items on factor 1 that were answered similarly by all respondents. Standard type -- items that differentiate between high and low (+ or -) factor loadings. Letter (A or E) -- indicates direction of response associated with positive loadings on the factors.

Interpretation of Findings.

As was previously indicated, the general purpose of this investigation was to determine the students' role, as defined by the teacher, and how this definition is perceived by the students and translated into actual behavior. Rather than use less direct methods, the Watson Analysis Schedule was used to ask the teachers what they thought their expectations were and to ask the students what expectations they perceived; both students and teachers were asked to identify realized expectations.

The general results of this investigation were presented in the previous section. The results indicate that there are systematic differences in student expectations between American Studies teachers and conventional American history teachers, and that there are differences in perceived expectations among students enrolled in these programs. As might be expected, these differences were found on all three parts of the WAS: Explicit Expectations, Actual Expectations, and Realized Expectations. Furthermore, they were apparent in the factor solutions obtained for the teachers and students on the three parts of the WAS.

The factor analyses for teachers yielded 7 to 9 factors, and those for students yielded 22 factors. However, in the latter analyses only the first 7 factors were large enough to yield useful information. In order to obtain descriptive closure on the factor structure of teachers' expectations, the identifiable item clusters for the factors were analyzed. These analyses yielded the factor descriptions. These are presented for the teachers in Table 46. The general consistency of the factor structure over the three parts of the WAS can be noted.

The general content-process orientations are readily observable from the table. Factors tended to stress teacher-centered recall as one

text continues on page 111.

TABLE 46

Factor Descriptions of Teachers' Perceptions

Explicit Expectations		Actual Expectations		Realized Expectations	
Description	Factor	Description	Factor	Description	Factor
Teacher initiated and directed problem-solving, with general panacean "outcomes"	1, *common*	Teacher initiated and directed problem-solving, allowing for student participation and decision-making; general panacean outcomes and consideration for affective (personal) characteristics	1, *common*		
Away from past-oriented recall delimited by academic requirements as conventionally evaluated	1, *not common*	Away from current problems, toward active discussion of past issues	3	Away from past-oriented uniform behavior, toward changed behavior in society	1, *not common*
Teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with non-critical acceptance by students	2	Away from non-critical teacher-centered recall, toward self-directed learning	4	Teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with non-critical acceptance by students	2
				Recall of teacher determined content, not relevant out of school	3
Away from recall, toward critical student participation confined to school without consideration for affective (personal) characteristics	3	Away from recall of teacher determined content, toward student-centered problems	2	Away from teacher-centered recall and means for continued learning, toward significant activity and teacher empathy	4

TABLE 46 (continued)

Explicit Expectations		Actual Expectations		Realized Expectations	
Description	Factor	Description	Factor	Description	Factor
Away from critical-creative participation by students, toward uniformity	4	Away from critical participation by students, toward uniformity	6		
Student as decision-maker, with individualized evaluation	5			Away from problem identification by students, toward decision-making in data gathering and evaluation	5
Student as decision-maker, with relevant activity	6	Student as decision-maker in data gathering	5		
		Teacher identified problems, with student centered problem-solving and decision-making	1, *not common*	Teacher identified problems, with student centered problem-solving and decision-making for self-understanding	1, *common*
Student directed problem solving, with significant decision-making	7			Critical thinking, with significant decision-making	6

orientation versus student-centered problem-solving, critical thinking, and decision-making as the other orientation. Further examination of Table 46, "Factor Description of Teachers' Perception," will allow one to note the high degree of consistency with which similar factors emerged from the teachers' responses and the relations among explicit, actual, and realized expectations. Even though there is a high degree of factor consistency among the three parts, it is evident that not all explicit and actual expectations are realized and, conversely, that not all realized expectations are formulated as explicit or actual ones.

In the teachers' perceptions the *general* expectation is that of "teacher initiated and directed problem-solving, with general panacean outcomes." When considering the actual expectations, this is expanded to include the dimension of student participation and decision-making, with consideration for personal-individual characteristics. This factor seems to reflect many of those qualities which have been advanced as being "good" teaching practices. These have been continually reinforced by educational theorists in professional literature and teacher training courses, by administrative personnel, and other groups interested in educational practices.

However, according to the teachers' perceptions this *general* factor is not realized. It is reduced to a factor which can be described as, "teacher identified problems, with student centered problem-solving and decision-making for self-understanding." This *general*, realized expectation is similar to the explicit and actual ones in that they both emphasize teacher-directed problem-solving as an approach to teaching social studies. The dimensions that have been lost in the realized aspect are those which deal with consideration for personal-individual characteristics and the panacean-type outcomes. Since these represent the utopian or ideal state of affairs, it is not surprising that they are not realized.

The remaining factors are associated with subgroups of teachers instead of the total teacher population. Consequently, they reflect expectations associated with specific programs (*i.e.,* American Studies or American history) or individual teachers independent of programs. These factors represent continua of responses. The descriptions presented reflect the extreme positions on the continua associated with positive factor loadings. Therefore, a single factor may be described from either extreme, and across the three parts may be described from both vantage points depending upon the directional (*i.e.,* + or -) scoring for the factor. The negatively scored factors are described as *"away from..."* the general orientation. A case in point is factor 2 for explicit expectations, "Teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with non-critical acceptance by students." This same general cluster emerged as factor 4 for actual expectations but scored on the opposite pole of the continuum and was stated as *"Away from* non-critical teacher-centered recall, *toward* self-directed learning." This factor emerged again in its original form as factor 2 on the realized portion.

The other two factors which emerged across all three parts centered on (1) consideration of past versus present issues and (2) recall of teacher determined content versus student-centered problems. These factors reflect the differences between the content-"historical" and the process-"social study" orientations for teaching social studies. The remaining factors, even though not represented on all three parts, tend to reflect the differences in these two orientations.

Several factors reflecting the above orientations were found to be associated with the programs. In each case, the American Studies teachers represented one end of the factor continuum and the American history teachers represented the other end. These factors and response directions are listed in Table 47.

TABLE 47

Teacher Factors Associated With Programs

WAS, Part	American Studies	American History
I	*Away from* past-oriented recall delimited by academic requirements as conventionally evaluated	*Toward* past-oriented recall delimited by academic requirements as conventionally evaluated
	Away from teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with non-critical acceptance by students	*Toward* teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with non-critical acceptance by students
	Toward student directed problem-solving, with significant decision-making	*Away from* student directed problem-solving, with significant decision-making
II	*Toward* teacher identified problems, with student centered problem-solving and decision-making	*Away from* teacher identified problems, with student centered problem-solving and decision-making
	Away from recall of teacher-determined content, *toward* student-centered problems	*Toward* recall of teacher-determined content, *away from* student-centered problems
III	*Away from* past-oriented uniform behavior, *toward* changed behavior in society	*Toward* past-oriented uniform behavior, *away from* changed behavior in society
	Away from teacher as exclusive decision-maker with non-critical acceptance by students	*Toward* teacher as exclusive decision-maker with non-critical acceptance by students

Of high import are the general orientations reflected in these factors and the consistency with which these orientations follow throughout. *The American Studies program as indicated by the teachers reflects student-centered problem-solving with emphasis on current issues. The converse is indicated as program characteristics by the American history teachers.*

Part III of this report contained a discussion and results of the development of American Studies objectives. As was noted in that part (page 29) those objectives departed radically from those of conventional American history and American literature courses in that they emphasized higher mental processes rather than rote recall of information. The consistency between those objectives and expectations for students' behavior as measured by the WAS is readily observable.

As was further noted in Part III, the American Studies teachers indicated that American literature and history are inseparable in their program. This is borne out in these results in that no separate factors emerged separating the six English specialists from the six history specialists. In fact there was greater homogeneity between these two groups within the American Studies program than was evidenced among the history teachers in the American Studies and American history programs. Furthermore, examination of the rotated factor solutions seems to indicate greater agreement among the 12 American Studies teachers than among the 19 American history teachers. These results would seem to indicate that the American Studies teachers are interacting and thus operating as a team. This would support the desirability of physical and administrative arrangements allowing for a high frequency of interaction among program personnel. *If teacher homogeneity of program orientation is considered a necessary condition for maximum team effectiveness, then these results indicate that the administrative* *arrangements allowing for common planning time, common flexible scheduling, and common physical facilities are not only conducive but perhaps necessary to this process.*

The differences between American Studies and American history teachers are further evidenced by examining the item clusters comprising the significant factors. The items which were generally agreed upon by the teachers in all programs are presented in Table 48, and those items which clustered about factors which differentiated between the two program orientations are presented in Table 49. By examining the common items in Table 48 the teacher-directed problem-solving approach and general panacean outcomes can be readily noted. The several items which make up this cluster permit common responses from teachers regardless of program orientation.

The items which differentiated between teachers in American Studies and those in American history are presented in Table 49 according to the group which responded to the items in the positive (*i.e.*, A & B) direction. These same items received negative responses from the other teacher groups. The teacher-centered recall orientation of the American history teachers as compared to the student-centered problem-solving orientation of the American Studies teachers can be easily noted by examining these items. These items further support the results previously presented.

As previously stated, the analyses of students' responses yielded 22 factors on each part of the WAS. However, only the first 7 factors were large enough to yield useful information. In order to obtain descriptive closure on the factor structure of students' expectations, the identifiable item clusters for the factors were analyzed. The resulting factor descriptions are presented in Table 50. It can be noted from Table 48 that there

text continues on page 126.

TABLE 48

Items on the WAS Which Were Responded to in the Same Direction by Most Teachers Regardless of Program

Direction of Response	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
A	Read from a required textbook.		Read from a required textbook.
A		Let the teacher decide what is to be studied.	
A	Use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.		
A	Detect bias.		
A	Let the teacher decide what is to be studied.		
A		Study problems by following steps directed by the teacher.	
A	Study problems identified by the teacher.		Study problems identified by the teacher.
A	Be able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their studies.	Be able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their studies.	
A			Recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.
A	Remember the ideas and beliefs of great men.	Remember the ideas and beliefs of great men.	
A	Discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.	Discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.	Discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.

TABLE 48 (continued)

Direction of Response	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
A	Make reports on assigned topics using encyclopaedias or similar sources.		Make reports on assigned topics using encyclopaedias or similar sources.
A		Be able to tell fact from opinion.	
A	Make reports or summarize their findings from studying a problem of their own choice.		
A			Define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.
A	Actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.		Actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.
A	Listen attentively to each other.	Listen attentively to each other.	Listen attentively to each other.
A		Try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.	
E	Be responsible for remembering facts found in the textbook or teacher lectures.		
A	Record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.	Record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.	
A	Get more facts than the textbook has when the facts are needed to understand basic problems.		
A		Be evaluated on an individual basis.	Be evaluated on an individual basis.
E	Be evaluated only on test scores and require written work.		

TABLE 48 (continued)

Direction of Response	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
A	Be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.		Be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.
A	Use facts to support or reject ideas.	Use facts to support or reject ideas.	Use facts to support or reject ideas.
A			Be evaluated on their ability in handling information to identify and solve problems.
A	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.	
			Suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.
A	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.
A	Learn how to make decisions in the real world.	Learn how to make decisions in the real world.	
A			Decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.
A	Learn how to recognize human social problems.	Learn how to recognize human social problems.	
A	Learn how to attack or solve social problems.	Learn how to attack or solve social problems.	
A		Learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.	Learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.

TABLE 48 (continued)

Direction of Response	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
E,A	Satisfy graduation requirements because of what is learned in class.	Satisfy graduation requirements because of what is learned in class.	Satisfy graduation requirements because of what is learned in class.
A	Be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.	Be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.	
A	Look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.	Look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.	
A	Understand human society because of what is learned in class.	Understand human society because of what is learned in class.	
A	Understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.	Understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.	Understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.
A		Make decisions that really matter.	
A	Speak frankly in class.	Speak frankly in class.	
A		Believe that the teacher accepts them for what they are.	
A		Believe that the teacher understands them.	
A		Be interested in what is being studied.	

TABLE 49

Items on the WAS Which Discriminate Between Teachers in the Experimental and Conventional Programs

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
E_p	Help decide what is to be studied.	Help decide what is to be studied.	Use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.
	Suggest methods, materials, activities, etc. for studying.	Suggest methods, materials, activities, etc. for studying.	
		Study problems identified by the teacher.	Select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.
	Be able to tell fact from opinion.	Select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.	Able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their own studies.
	Develop their own methods of studying problems.	Develop their own methods of studying problems.	
	Define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.	Recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.	
	Draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.	Make reports or summarize their findings from studying a problem of their own choice.	Draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.
	Draw conclusions, as a group about the meaning of the lesson.	Draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.	Draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.
	Call attention to confused or unrelated statements made by the teacher.		Do most of the talking.

TABLE 49 (continued)

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
EP	Evaluate their own progress.	Be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.	Try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.
	Be evaluated on their ability in handling information to identify and solve problems.	Be evaluated on their ability in handling information to identify and solve problems.	Record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.
	Suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.	Suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.	
	Suggest procedures for getting information.	Decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.	Learn how to attack or solve social problems.
	Decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.		
	Learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.		
	Change the way they behave in society because of what is learned in class.		Change the way they behave in society because of what is learned in class.
	Make decisions that really matter.		

TABLE 49 (continued)

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
C	Discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.	Remember the names, places, events and dates.	Discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.
	Study problems by following steps directed by the teacher.		Let the teacher do most of the talking.
	Believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.		
	Listen to the teacher give lectures.	Listen to the teacher give lectures.	
	Take notes from teacher lectures.	Take notes from teacher lectures.	
	Study things that are useful only in school.		Evaluated only on test scores and required written work.
		Be responsible for remembering facts found in the textbook or teacher lextures.	
		All be evaluated on the same basis.	All be evaluated on the same basis.

TABLE 50

Factor Description of Students' Perceptions

Explicit Expectations		Actual Expectations		Realized Expectations	
Description	Factor	Description	Factor	Description	Factor
				Away from recall and uncritical acceptance of teachers' statements, while accepting authority of text and lectures; toward societal understanding and decision-making	1, *common*
Teacher directed problem-solving, allowing for student participation and decision-making; not limited to school applications	1, *common*	Teacher directed problem-solving, allowing for student participation and decision-making	1, *common*		
Away from decision-making and significant outcomes	1, *not common*			Away from significant activities, outcomes and interests of students	4
		Acquisition of factual content, limited to the past, for future utility	4		
Away from student critical participation in problem-solving, toward past oriented recall and uniformity	2	Teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with non-critical acceptance by students; away from relevant mode of continued learning	1, *not common*	Away from critical participation in problem-solving and enjoyment of activities	1, *not common*

TABLE 50 (continued)

Explicit Expectations		Actual Expectations		Realized Expectations	
Description	Factor	Description	Factor	Description	Factor
Away from student participation in problem-solving, and relevant learnings, toward noncritical acceptance	3				
		Student-Teacher interaction in significant activity	3	Student-teacher interaction in limited problem-solving without making reports	3
Student as decision-maker, within an open and accepting climate	4	Open climate for significant decision-making by students, excepting topic for study	7		
Teacher directed learning, away from critical participation and understanding of society	5			Away from problem-solving, toward study limited to school applications and uniformity	6
		Away from problems based on students' interests and experiences	5		
				Away from problem-solving and meaning, toward better citizenship	5
		Away from self-evaluation	6		

TABLE 50 (continued)

Explicit Expectations		Actual Expectations		Realized Expectations	
Description	Factor	Description	Factor	Description	Factor
Student critical participation in problem-solving decisions	6	Student critical participation in problem-solving and decision-making, with "self"-social learning	2	Student critical participation in problem-solving, with an open climate; skill not limited to school application	2
				Student participation in problem development, with self evaluation	7

is considerable consistency among factor descriptions for the three parts. However, this consistency is not as great as that noted for the teacher.

The general orientations for students are consistent with those noted for teachers. The students tend to stress teacher-centered recall as one orientation versus student-centered critical participation in problem-solving and decision-making. However, many specific factor descriptions were not obtained on all three parts. It is evident that the students feel that not all explicit and actual expectations are realized and, conversely, that not all realized expectations are formulated as explicit or actual ones.

It is interesting that the *general* expectation of "Teacher directed problem-solving, allowing for student participation and decision-making" was agreed upon by both the teachers and the students. The students indicated that the teachers explicitly expected this not to be limited to school application. They did not indicate the expectations for general panacean outcomes with consideration for personal-individual characteristics as did the teachers.

Moreover, according to the students' perceptions this *general* factor is not realized. Instead they see their role as being "*away from* recall and uncritical acceptance of teachers' statements, while accepting authority of text and lectures; *toward* societal understanding and decision-making." This would indicate that the students feel comfortable in general student-teacher interaction. However, they seem to be predisposed to accept factual material when presented through the authority of teachers or texts. This result is not surprising since most students, as they have progressed through the grades, have received continual reinforcement for this mode of behavior.

The remaining factors are associated with subgroups of students instead of the total student sample. Consequently, they reflect expectations associated with specific programs (*i.e.*, American Studies or American history as presented in programs C1 or C2) or individual students independent of the programs in which they are enrolled. As with the descriptions of the teacher factors, the descriptions in Table 50 are reported from the vantage point of the extreme positions on the continua associated with positive factor loadings.

The two factors which appear in all three parts reflect the differences between the content-process orientations toward teaching social studies. One of these factors stresses the "Teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with non-critical acceptance by students," while the other stresses "Student critical participation in problem solving and decision making." In the latter factor, when actual and realized expectations are taken into account the following dimensions emerge: self-understanding, social learning, and the development of skills not limited to school application, within an open classroom climate.

Several factors reflecting these orientations were found to be associated with the programs. In most cases the American Studies students typified one end of the factor continua and the American history students enrolled in one or both of the control programs typified the other end. In a few instances, students enrolled in one or the other of the two control programs displayed agreement with the American Studies position. These factors and response directions are listed in Table 51.

Examination of Table 51 will point up the consistency with which the American Studies students perceive their role as that of critical participation in problem-solving and decision-making. Comparison of these results with those of the American history students will underscore that they tend to perceive their role as that of non-critical acceptance on the part of students.

However, the difference between the two American history programs as perceived by the students combined with the partial similarities to the

text continues on page 131.

TABLE 51

Student Factors Associated with Programs

WAS, Part	American Studies	American History, C1	American History, C2
I	*Toward* decision-making and significant outcomes	*Toward* decision-making and significant outcomes	*Away from* decision-making and significant outcomes
	Toward student critical participation in problem-solving, *away from* past-oriented recall and uniformity		*Away from* student critical participation in problem-solving, *toward* past-oriented recall and uniformity
	Toward student participation in problem-solving, and relevant learnings; *away from* noncritical acceptance	*Away from* student participation in problem-solving, and relevant learnings; *toward* noncritical acceptance	
	Toward student as decision-maker, within an open and accepting climate	*Away from* student as decision-maker, within an open and accepting climate	*Toward* student as decision-maker, within an open and accepting climate
	Toward student critical participation in problem-solving decisions		*Away from* student critical participation in problem-solving decisions
II	*Away from* teachers as exclusive decision-maker, with noncritical acceptance by students; *toward* relevant mode of continued learning	*Away from* teachers as exclusive decision-maker, with noncritical acceptance by students; *toward* relevant mode of continued learning	*Toward* teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with noncritical acceptance by students; *away from* relevant mode of continued learning

TABLE 51 (continued)

WAS, Part	American Studies	American History, C1	American History, C2
II	*Toward* student critical participation in problem-solving and decision making, with "self"-social learning		*Away from* student critical participation in problem-solving and decision-making with "self"-social learning
		Away from acquisition of factual content, limited to the past, for future utility	*Toward* acquisition of factual content, limited to the past, for future utility
		Toward problems based on students' interests and experiences	*Away from* problems based on students' interests and experiences
III	*Toward* critical participation in problem-solving and enjoyment of activities		*Away from* critical participation in problem-solving and enjoyment of activities
	Toward critical participation in problem-solving, with an open climate; skill not limited to school application		*Away from* critical participation in problem-solving, with an open climate; skill not limited to school application
		Away from student-teacher interaction in limited problem-solving *with* making reports	*Toward* student-teacher interaction in limited problem-solving *without* making reports

TABLE 51 (continued)

WAS, Part	American Studies	American History, C1	American History, C2
III	*Toward* problem-solving and meaning, *away from* better citizenship	*Away from* problem-solving and meaning, *toward* better citizenship	*Toward* problem-solving and meaning, *away from* better citizenship
	Toward student participation in problem development, with self evaluation		*Away from* student participation in problem development, with self evaluation

American Studies orientation reflects a lack of consistency in expectations for these two programs. It can be observed from Table 51 that this lack of consistency yields conflicting expectations wherein students in both American history groups see themselves as being in a program featuring teacher-centered decision-making with non-critical acceptance by students. In some instances they departed from this mode and reflected some characteristics of the student problem-solving and decision-making model. It should be noted that this conflict did not appear for the American history teachers.

The previous discussion has pointed to the general orientations reflected in these factors. *The American Studies program as indicated by the students reflects critical student participation in problem-solving and decision-making. The converse--however, with exceptions--is indicated by American history students as characterizing their programs.*

These results can also be noted in Tables 52 and 53 which present item clusters associated with the *general* factor and several differentiating factors. Examination of these items indicates that the dimension of the accumulation and utilization of facts is present in both the content-"historical" and process-"social study" orientations. Further examination would suggest that the accumulation of facts is important to both orientations but that there is a distinction between them in the *manner of the utilization of these facts*. In the former orientation, the emphasis seems to be upon the recall of facts; in the latter orientation, the emphasis seems to be upon the utilization of facts for problem-solving and decision-making.

In view of analyses for the teachers, these results for the students take on even greater import. The consistency between the written objectives

text continues on page 142.

TABLE 52

Items on the WAS Which Were Responded to in the Same Direction by Most Students Regardless of Program

Direction of Response	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
A	Read from a required textbook.	Read from a required textbook.	
E	Help decide what is to be studied.		
A		Study problems identified by the teacher.	
A	Develop their own methods of studying problems.		
E			Remember the ideas and beliefs of great men.
A	Study problems by following steps directed by the teacher.		
A	Be able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their studies.	Be able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their studies.	
A			Believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.
A		Be able to tell fact from opinion.	
A			Call attention to confused or unrelated statements made by the teacher.

TABLE 52 (continued)

Direction of Response	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
A		Actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.	
A			Learn how to make decisions in the real world.
E	Study things that are useful only in school.		
A			Understand human society because of what is learned in class.
A	Be interested in what is being studied.		

TABLE 53

Items on the WAS Which Discriminate
Among Students in the Experimental
and Conventional Programs

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
Ep	Use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.		Use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.
			Help decide what is to be studied.
		Detect bias.	Detect bias.
	Suggest methods, materials, activities, etc., for studying.	Suggest methods, materials, activities, etc., for studying.	
	Select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.		Select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.
	Select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.	Select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.	
		Develop their own methods of studying problems.	
	Recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.	Recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.	Recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.
			Discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.

TABLE 53 (continued)

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
Ep	Question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.	Question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.	Question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.
	Make reports or summarize their findings from studying a problem of their own choice.	Make reports or summarize their findings from studying a problem of their own choice.	
	Define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.		Define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.
		Draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.	
	Actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.		Actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.
	Draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.	Draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.	
	Do most of the talking.	Do most of the talking.	
	Call attention to confused or unrelated statements made by the teacher.		
	Try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.	Try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.	
			Record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.

TABLE 53 (continued)

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
E_P	Be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.	Be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.	
	Be evaluated on an individual basis.		
	Evaluate their own progress.		
	Suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.		Suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.
	Suggest procedures for getting information.		Suggest procedures for getting information.
	Decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.	Decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.	Decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.
	Decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.	Decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.	Decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.
			Use facts to support or reject ideas.
	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.		Try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.

TABLE 53 (continued)

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
EP	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.
	Learn how to make decisions in the real world.	Learn how to make decisions in the real world.	
	Learn how to recognize human social problems.	Learn how to recognize human social problems.	
	Learn how to attack or solve social problems.	Learn how to attack or solve social problems.	Learn how to attack or solve social problems.
		Learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.	
	Be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.	Be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.	
		Look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.	Look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.
		Change the way they behave in society because of what is learned in class.	
		Understand human society because of what is learned in class.	
	Understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.	Understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.	

TABLE 53 (continued)

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
EP	Learn the facts that they will need once they get out of school.		
	Continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.	Continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.	Continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.
	Enjoy what they are doing.		Enjoy what they are doing.
	Make decisions that really matter.		
	Speak frankly in class.		Speak frankly in class.
	Believe that the teacher accepts them for what they are.		
C1	Believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.	Use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.	
		Suggest methods, materials, activities, etc., for studying.	Make reports on assigned topics using encyclopaedias or similar sources.
	Define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.	Select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.	
		Develop their own methods of studying problems.	
		Question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.	

TABLE 53 (continued)

Problems	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
C1	Be evaluated on an individual basis.	Make reports or summarize their own findings from studying a problem of their own choice.	Make reports or summarize their own findings from studying a problem of their own choice.
	Evaluate their own progress.	Draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.	
		Draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.	
		Do most of the talking.	
		Be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.	
	Decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.	Decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.	
	Be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.	Decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.	Be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.
	Understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.		
	Learn the facts that they will need once they get out of school.	Learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.	
	Make decisions that really matter.		

TABLE 53 (continued)

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
C1		Look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.	
		Continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.	
C2	Suggest methods, materials, activities, etc., for studying.	Let the teacher decide what is to be studied.	Select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.
		Select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.	
	Remember the names of men, places, events and dates.		Draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.
	Discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.	Discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.	Listen to the teacher give lectures.
		Believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.	Listen attentively to each other.
	Let the teacher do most of the talking.	Let the teacher do most of the talking.	
	Take notes from teacher lectures.		Take notes from teacher lectures.

TABLE 53 (continued)

Programs	Items Responded to in a Positive Direction (A & B)		
	Explicit Expectations	Actual Expectations	Realized Expectations
C2	Be evaluated only on test scores and required written work.	Be evaluated only on test scores and required written work.	
	All be evaluated on the same basis.	All be evaluated on the same basis.	
			Evaluated on an individual basis.
	Decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.		
		Try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.	Try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.
	Enjoy what they are doing.		
		Learn the facts that they will need once they get out of school.	
			Try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.
			Learn how to attack or solve social problems.
			Look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.
	Speak frankly in class.		
	Believe that the teacher accepts them for what they are.		

as presented in Part III and the teachers' perceptions of the student role were noted previously. It now can be noted that the students' perceptions of their own role is also consistent with these; and, thus achieving closure for the *written goals - teachers' perceptions - students' perceptions* triad. This high degree of agreement lends credence to the ability of a school faculty to implement a social studies curriculum which includes active, critical student participation in problem-solving and decision-making.

These results further support the learning statement cited in the introduction to this investigation (page 33) in that the general goal orientation of the American Studies program has been successfully communicated to the students and seems to fit their need disposition as reflected in the realized expectations. This is further supported by the factor descriptions wherein American Studies students evidenced an enjoyment of activities while the American history students in the most teacher-centered program indicated the converse.

In summary, the results presented in this report strongly support the *if-then* hypotheses put forward as the focus for this investigation (page 38):

> *If* programs differ, *then* students
> within the programs will perceive
> different expectations.

In a like manner, they permit reliable inferences to the first 4 research questions posed on pages 38-40. These inferences suggest that:

1. Teachers in conventional programs and teachers in American Studies *have different expectations* for their students.
2. Students in conventional programs and students in American Studies *perceive different expectations.*
3. Teachers in conventional programs and teachers in American Studies *perceive different actual student behaviors.*

4. Students in conventional programs and students in American Studies *perceive different actual student behaviors.*

The remaining research questions were not analyzed since the final computer output is not available at the time of this writing. The writers expect to present this concluding data as an addendum to this report. However, the inconsistencies pointed out in the student analyses with regard to the American history groups suggest that the congruency of teacher-student expectations and explicit-actual-realized expectations might be higher for the American Studies program than for either of the American history programs.

If it is assumed that a necessary characteristic of an innovative program is that it departs from conventional practices, these data offer strong support for the contention that American Studies as carried on by the teachers at the University City Senior High School is, in actuality, an innovation.

References:

1. "A Directory of Social Studies Projects." *Social Education.* 31:509-511, October, 1967.

2. Balcom, Max. "American Studies." *Impact of New Ideas in Education.* School District of University City, University City, Missouri, 37, 1968.

3. Bayles, Ernest E. "Experiments with Reflective Teaching." *Kansas Studies in Education.* University of Kansas, Lawrence, (vol. 6,no. 3), 1956.

4. Berman, Louise M. *New Priorities in the Curriculum.* Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus, Ohio, 1968, 241 pp.

5. Boyer, M.A. *et. al.* *The Process of Change at the Senior High School,* University City, Missouri. A Publication of the National Demonstration Schools Project, Title III of ESEA.

6. Broom, Leonard, and Selznick, Philip. *Sociology.* Row, Peterson and Company, Evanston, Illinois, 1955.

7. Craig, Robert C. *The Psychology of Learning in the Classroom.* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1966.

8. Charters, W.W., Jr. "The Social Background of Teaching." In *Handbook of Research on Teaching,* edited by N. L. Gage, Rand McNally and Company, Chicago, 1963, pp. 788-803.

9. Fair, Jean, and Shaftel, Fannie R. *Effective Thinking in the Social Studies.* Thirty-seventh Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C., 1967, 279 pp.

10. Fenton, Edwin. *The New Social Studies.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., Chicago, 1967, 144 pp.

11. Getzels, Jacob W., and Thelen, Herbert A. "The Classroom as a Unique Social System." In *The Dynamics of Instructional Groups,* edited by Nelson B. Henry, Fifty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 2, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960, pp. 53-82.

12. Hunt, Maurice P. and Metcalf, Laurence E. *Teaching High School Social Studies.* Harper and Row, Publishers, Evanston, 1968, 463 pp.

13. Massialas, Byron G. (ed.) *The Indiana Experiments in Inquiry: The Social Studies.* Bulletin of the School of Education, vol. 39, no. 3, Indiana University, Bloomington, May, 1963, 142 pp.

14. Oliver, Donald W. and Shaver, James P. Teaching Public Issues in the High School. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966, 330 pp.

15. Snygg, Donald. "A Cognitive Field Theory of Learning." In Learning and Mental Health in the Schools. Edited by Walter B. Waetjen and Robert R. Leeper, Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, Washington, D.C., 1966, pp. 77-96.

APPENDIX A

AMERICAN STUDIES COURSE OUTLINE
1968-1969

AMERICAN STUDIES OUTLINE

UNIT I: THE DREAM ESTABLISHED 1607-1783

I. Week One: September 3 - 6

  A. Subject:
    1. Who came and why?
    2. The Puritans
    3. Introduction to expository composition
    4. Library orientation
    5. Introduction to historical terms

  B. Readings:
    1. Essay on Puritanism from "The American Mind in the Making" (Mimeo), and Frizzle, "The Puritan," 57-60
    2. Case Studies of Three Seventeenth Century Families (Mimeo)
    3. "Social Origins of Some Early Americans" - Campbell (Mimeo)
    4. Bragdon, pp. 12 - 14, Frizzle, 48 - 54.
    5. Bailey, pp. 3 - 21.
    6. Definition of history and historical terms, (Mimeo) Frizzle, XIII - XVI
    7. Map and Chart of the Colonies, Bragdon, 20 - 21

  C. Composition:
    1. Macmillan - "Levels of Usage" and introductory thesis paragraphs chapter 4.
    2. Theme I

II. Week Two: September 9 - 13

  A. Subject:
    1. The Puritan Dream: "A City Upon a Hill"

  B. Readings:
    1. _The Bay Psalm Book_ (Newcomer)
    2. _The New England Primer_ (Newcomer)
    3. _The Old Deluder Law,_ Frizzle, pp. 63 - 64
    4. Jonathan Edwards' Conversion Experience from _A Bit of Autobiography_ (Newcomer)
    5. William Bradford, from _Plimouth Plantation,_ "Mayflower Compact" (Mimeo), and "The Landing at Plimouth (Mimeo)
    6. John Winthrop, "On Liberty" (Mimeo) "A Model of Christian Charity" (Mimeo)
    7. Bragdon, p. 22 "The Yankee Puritan"
    8. Bailey, pp. 22 - 36.

III. Week Three: September 16 - 20

  A. Subject:
    1. The Puritans and the Roger Williams Case Study: Authority vs. Individual Freedom

  B. Readings:
    1. Poetry:
      a. Anne Bradstreet (Newcomer)
      b. Michael Wiggleworth (Newcomer)
      c. Edward Taylor (Mimeo)

Week Three: September 16 - 20 (continued) Page 2

2. Roger Williams:
    a. "Roger Williams, Dissenter in the Holy Commonwealth" (Mimeo)
    b. "The Story of Roger Williams," Frizzle, pp. 65-68
    c. *The Bloody Tenet of Persecution* (Newcomer)
    d. "Letter to Town of Providence 1655" (Mimeo)
3. Bailey, pp. 27 - 28

C. Composition: Theme IIa - Opinion on Roger Williams Trial (half of the class)

IV. Week Four: September 23 - 27

A. Subject:
1. (continuation of the Puritans)
2. Virginia: A Study in Contrast; Nathaniel Bacon Case Study: Authority vs. Individual Freedom

B. Readings:
1. *The Scarlet Letter*
2. "Nathaniel Bacon's Rebellion: Virginia, 1676" (Mimeo)
3. Bacon's Rebellion, Frizzle, pp. 82 - 85
4. "Background on Virginia" (Mimeo)
5. Bailey, p.16; See index: Virginia, colonial
6. "Nat Bacon's Bones" - Macleish (Mimeo)

C. Composition: Theme IIb - Opinion on the Bacon Debate (half class only)

V. Week Five: September 30 - Oct. 4

A. Subject:
1. The Decline of Puritanism and the Contributions of the Puritans
2. What made Americans different from Englishmen? A problem in historiography

B. Readings:
1. "Trials at Salem" Benet (Mimeo)
2. Samuel Sewell's *Diary* (Newcomer) and Mimeo
3. Frizzle, "Samuel Sewall, Reviewing a Hypothesis," pp. 62 - 63.
4. Cotton Mather's *Diary* (Newcomer)
5. *The Crucible*
6. "The Puritan Strain" Schlatter (Mimeo)
7. "Interpretations of the Colonial Experience" (Mimeo)

C. Lecture: The American Character and the Colonial Heritage

D. Composition: Theme III

VI. Week Six: October 7 - 11

A. Subject: The Dream Redefined

B. Readings:
1. Essay on the Enlightenment from "The American Mind in the Making" (Mimeo)
2. Jonathan Edwards:
    a. "The Flying Spider" (New)
    b. "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God" (New)
    c. A Bit of Autobiography (New)
3. Benjamin Franklin:
    a. from Autobiography (New)
    b. "The Way to Wealth" (New)
4. Hector Crevecouer:
    a. Letters from an American Farmer (New)
    b. Sketches of Eighteenth Century America (New)
5. Background of American Revolution
    a. Frizzle, 98 - 99, 113 - 121, 167 - 183.
6. Thomas Paine, "Common Sense" (Newcomer) and Frizzle, 124 - 125.
7. Thomas Jefferson, "Declaration of Independence" Bragdon & Frizzle, 108 - 112
8. "Daniel Leonard Deplores Rebellion" (Mimeo)
9. "Vengeance on the Tories" (Mimeo)
10. "The Hanging of a Loyalist" (Mimeo)
11. "Peter Hendricks, Patriot or Loyalist" (Mimeo)
12. Bragdon, pp. 32 - 69
13. Bailey, pp. 84 - 124
14. The Road to Independence
15. Military History of the Revolution, Frizzle, 128 - 166, 183 - 189
16. Time Line of the Revolutionary Period, Frizzle, p. 189

AMERICAN STUDIES - I

UNIT II: THE DREAM REDEFINED, 1783-1824

I. Week 7: October 14 - 18

  A. Subject: 1. Origins and Interpretation of the Constitution

  B. Readings:
    1. Origins of the Constitution
    2. Constitution and Notes, (Bragdon)
    3. Bragdon, pp. 79-101, 103-147
    4. Bailey, pp. 125-148
    5. Frizzle, pp. 194-195, 197-198, 198-205, 218-222, 222-231

  C. Composition:
    1. Diagnostic Exam on Grammar
    2. Theme IV: Argument

II. Week 8: October 21 - 25

  A. Subject: Civil Liberties; A Delicate Balance, Order vs. Liberty

  B. Readings:
    1. Frizzle, pp. 232-233
    2. Parker, Civil Liberties
      a. Introduction, pp. 1-12
      b. Protecting the Rights of the Accused, pp. 13-58
      c. Freedom of Religion, pp. 131-155
      d. Freedom of Expression, pp. 157-188
      e. Price of Our Civil Liberties, pp. 189-206
    3. Bill of Rights and Notes (Bragdon)
    4. Supreme Court In American Life, Prob. 10, 11, 12 14, 15.

  C. Lecture: Nationalistic Painting and Music

  D. Composition: Macmillan: Effective Sentences

III. Week 9: October 28 - November 1

  A. Subject: Civil Liberties (continued)

  B. Composition: Macmillan continued
    Theme V: Civil Liberties

  C. Film: "The Ox-Bow Incident"

IV. Week 10: November 4 - 8

  A. Subject:
    1. Civil Liberties (continued)
    2. Hamilton and Jefferson, Two Views of the Dream

  B. Readings:
    1. Supreme Court (continued)
    2. Hamilton vs. Jefferson (mimeo)
    3. Bragdon, pp. 157-194
    4. Bailey, pp. 149-182
    5. Frizzle, pp. 241-244

  C. Composition: Macmillan continued

UNIT II: THE DREAM REDEFINED, 1783-1824

V. Week 11: November 11 - 15

A. Subject:
1. Hamilton vs. Jefferson (continued)
2. Marshall and the Supreme Court

B. Readings:
1. Supreme Court in American Life Prob. 1, 2, 3, 4
2. Bragdon, pp. 193-4, 229-231
3. Bailey, pp. 185-7, 232-4, 265-269
4. Frizzle, pp. 244-256, 256-268, 235-237, 348-351, 351-353, 359-360

C. Composition: Macmillan continued

AMERICAN STUDIES 1 - OUTLINE

UNIT III - EXPANSION OF THE DREAM, 1812-1850

I. Week Twelve - November 18 - 22

A. Subject:
  1. The Turner Thesis and the Westward Movement
  2. A New Spirit in Literature - Romanticism

B. Readings:
  1. Washington Irving, a. "Author's Account of Himself" (New)
     b. "Rip Van Winkle" (New)
  2. William Cullen Bryant, a. "Thanatopsis (New)
     b. "To a Waterfowl" (New)
  3. James Fenimore Cooper from *The Deerslayer* (New)
  4. The Turner Thesis (Mimeo) and Frizzle, 324 - 325.
  5. Frizzle, Territorial Expansion of the U.S., 274 - 293, 354 - 358.
  6. Bragdon, pp. 241 - 245
  7. Bailey, pp. 280 - 299.
  8. Map exercise: See Bragdon pp. 312 - 313 and the selection from the *Dictionary of American History* (Mimeo)
  9. "Frontier Types on the Ohio Valley Frontier" (Mimeo)
  10. Frizzle, "Observers of the Westward Movement," 293 - 297.
  11. Frizzle, "Why Pioneers Went West, 314 - 318
  12. Personal Narratives, 385 - 391.
  13. Folklore of the Frontier, 397, 402, 435 - 437, Frizzle

II. Week Thirteen - November 25 - 27.

A. Subject:
  1. The Early Stages of Industrialization
  2. Transcendentalism

B. Readings:
  1. *The Hero and the People*, pp. 71 - 78 (on Emerson)
  2. Ralph Waldo Emerson, a. "The American Scholar" (Mimeo)
     b. "Self-Reliance" (New)
  3. Michael Chevalier, "On Speculation" (Mimeo)
  4. Alexis de Tocqueville, "What Causes Almost All Americans to Follow Industrial Callings" (Mimeo)
  5. *Labor in American Society*, Problem 3
  6. Bragdon, pp. 239 - 241
  7. Bailey, pp. 300 - 318
  8. Frizzle, 392 - 396, 402.

C. Lecture: Hudson River School of Art

D. Composition: Theme VI

III. Week Fourteen - December 2 - 6

- A. Subject:
  - 1. Jacksonian Democracy
  - 2. Transcendentalism continued
- B. Readings:
  - 1. Henry David Thoreau,
    - a. Walden (New)
    - b. "Civil Disobedience" (Mimeo)
  - 2. Bancroft, "But True Political Science..." (Mimeo)
  - 3. de Tocqueville, "The Unlimited Power of the Majority in the U.S." (Mimeo)
  - 4. Arthur M. Schlesinger, "Tradisions of Democracy"
  - 5. Bragdon, pp. 257 - 272
  - 6. Bailey, pp. 243 - 279
  - 7. The Hero and the People
  - 8. Frizzle, 326 - 345, 360 - 366
- C. Lecture: Genre Painting and Songs of the Common Man

IV. Week Fifteen - December 9 - 13

- A. Subject:
  - 1. Jacksonian Democracy
  - 2. Transcendental Poetry
- B. Readings:
  - 1. Frizzle (Continued)
  - 2. The Hero and the People
  - 3. Walt Whitman,
    - a. "Song of Myself" (New)
    - b. "Song of Myself", section 6 (Mimeo)
    - c. "I Hear America Singing" (New)
    - d. "Crossing Brooklyn Ferry" (New)
    - e. "Passage to India" (Mimeo)
- C. Composition: Theme VII

AMERICAN STUDIES 1 - OUTLINE

UNIT IV - THE DILEMMA OF THE DREAM, 1850-1865

I. Week Sixteen - December 16 - 20

A. Subject:
1. Background of Slavery
2. Whitman continued and The Moral Realists

B. Readings:
1. Walt Whitman,
    a. "The Wound Dresser" (New)
    b. "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd" (New)
2. Nathaniel Hawthorne - Short Stories
3. *Negro in America,* Problems 1, 2, 3
4. Frizzle, Slave Charts and Slave Codes, 456 - 457, 473 - 474
5. Frizzle, "Early Views of Slavery," 453 - 456
6. "Nat Turner's Own Story" (Mimeo)
7. "Douglass Writes His Former Master" (Mimeo)
8. "Douglass Discusses Slavery" (Mimeo)

C. Composition: "Theme VIII

D. Lecture: The Origins of Chattel Slavery

II. Week Seventeen - January 2 - 3

A. Subject:
1. Pro and Anti-Slavery Arguments
2. The Moral Realists continued

B. Readings:
1. Hawthorne, "Young Goodman Brown" (Mimeo)
2. Herman Melville, *Billy Budd*
3. "The Southern Defense of Chattel Slavery" (Mimeo)
4. Frizzle, "Morality of Slavery," 474
5. "Anti-Slavery Arguments" (Mimeo)

C. Composition: Theme IX

III. Week Eighteen - January 6 - 10

A. Subject:
1. The Civil War
2. The Moral Realists continued

B. Readings:
1. *Billy Budd*
2. Frizzle, Background of the Civil War, 450 - 453, 458 - 472, 476 - 494.
3. *The Union Divides*
4. "Causes of the Civil War" (Mimeo)
5. Bragdon, p. 324 - 330
6. Bailey, p. 374 - 415

C. Lecture: Civil War Music

IV. Week Nineteen - January 13 - 17

A. Subject:
1. The Civil War (continued)
2. Lincoln

B. Readings:
1. "Herman Melville" - W. H. Auden (Mimeo)
2. "Gettysburg Address" (Newcomer)
3. "Second Inaugural Address" (Newcomer)
4. Catton, "Hayfoot, Strawfoot," (Mimeo)
5. Catton, "Prison Camps of the Civil War", (Mimeo)
6. Sandburg Sampler (Mimeo)
7. Negro in America, Prob. 4
8. Bragdon, pp. 334 - 355
9. Bailey, pp. 416 - 458
10. Frizzle, 494 - 499

C. Film: True Story of the Civil War

V. Week Twenty - January 20 - 24

A. Subject: 1: Civil War (continued)

AMERICAN STUDIES OUTLINE

SECOND SEMESTER - UNIT I: THE DREAM DEFERRED

I. Week One - January 27 - 31

A. Subject: The Negro and the American Dream

B. Readings:
1. The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn
2. The Negro in America
3. Point of view: Advanced Composition, pp. 389 - 392
4. Macmillan
5. Bailey, pp. 459 - 482 (see index for additional reading)
6. Bragdon, pp. 358 - 370, pp. 675 - 679
7. Frizzle, 499 - 510

C. Composition: A study of point of view

Theme I

II. Week Two - February 3 - 7

A. Subject: (continuation of Week One)

B. Films:
1. Huck Finn - What Does It Say?
2. Huck Finn - "The Art of Huck Finn"
3. Huck Finn - "The American Experience"

III. Week Three - February 10 - 14

A. Subject: (continuation of week one)

B. Lecture: America's Contribution to Music: Jazz

IV. Week Four - February 17 - 27

A. Subject: (continuation of week one)

B. Readings:
1. Frizzle, 728 - 741
2. Ballwin; "As Seen by a Contemporary Negro Writer" (Mimeo)
3. "The Ideology of White Supremacy" (Mimeo)
4. Carmichel, "What We Want" (Mimeo)
5. "Intimidation, Reprisal, and Fear" (Mimeo)
6. "Poor Folks Campaign Hits D.C." (Mimeo)
7. "Committee of 160 Tells it Lak 'Tis" (Mimeo)
8. Lester Pines "The Negro and University City" (Mimeo)
9. Handout on Wilbur Mills

AMERICAN STUDIES OUTLINE

UNIT TWO: INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: FAILURE OR FULFILLMENT OF THE DREAM

I. Week Five - February 24 - 28

A. Subject: The Changing and Growing America is reflected in the growth of the cities, immigration, big business and agricultural discontent.

B. Readings:
1. Frizzle, 545 - 548
2. Bragdon, 380 - 382, 390 - 392
3. Bailey, 448 - 449, 535 - 536, 542 - 548
4. Charts on cities and immigration (Mimeo)
5. Rise of Silas Lapham or Babbitt

II. Week Six - March 3 - 7

A. Subject: Man Adapts to Industrialism by seeing it as a means to improve the Old Order.

B. Readings:
1. Rise of Silas Lapham or Babbitt
2. "Farewell My Lovely" - White (Adv. Comp.)
3. Business
    a. Frizzle, The Rise of Trusts, 583 - 589
    b. Frizzle, Essays on Corporations, Carnegie, and Rockefeller, 547 - 558.
    c. Frizzle, The Gilded Age, 559 - 562
    d. Frizzle, The Ideas of the Gilded Age Success and Society, 562 - 567
4. Labor
    Labor in American Society: Problems 6,7,8,10, 12 (I), 15 (II)
    a. "What Ails the Union?", Fortune Magazine (Mimeo)
    b. "The Myth of the Happy Worker," (Mimeo)
    c. "Challenge of Automation" (Mimeo)
    d. Frizzle, 575 - 576, 579 - 582
    e. Bragdon, 381 - 399
    f. Bailey, 519 - 536

C. Composition: Theme III Point of View on Babbitt or The Rise of Silas Lapham.

D. Lecture: "Architecture and the Industrial Age," Wright and Sullivan

AMERICAN STUDIES OUTLINE

UNIT TWO: INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: FAILURE OR FULFILLMENT OF THE DREAM?

III. Week Seven - March 10 - 14

A. Subject: Man Resists Because He Is Hostile to a Growing Industrial Society.

B. Readings:
1. "The Gift Outright" - Frost (Mimeo)
2. "Neighbor Rosicky" - Cather (C.A.P.)
3. "Land" - Lewis (C.A.P.)
4. "Under the Lion's Paw" - Garland (Mimeo)
5. "Man With A Hoe" - Markham (Newcomer)
6. Grapes of Wrath - Steinbeck (Mimeo)
7. "Barn Burning" - Faulkner (Adv. Comp.)

(Each student will read some of the following:)
Bragdon: pp. 418 - 424, 444 - 450
Bailey: pp. 579 - 605

8. "Deal In Wheat" - Norris (Mimeo)
9. "Grasshopper Plague" - (Mimeo)
10. "Debt and Taxes" - (Mimeo)
11. Supreme Court In American Life (Munn U. Ill.) (Wabash Case)
12. "Populist Party Platform" - (Bragdon)
13. "Cross of Gold" - Bryan (Mimeo)
14. "What's The Matter With Kansas" - White (Mimeo)
15. "Triumph of McKinley" (Mimeo)

IV. Week Eight - March 17 - 21

A. Subject: (Continuation of Week Five)

B. Readings:
1. "Two Tramps in Mud-Time" - Frost (Mimeo)
2. "Laughing Corn" - Sandburg (Newcomer)
3. "A Man Said To The Universe" - Crane (Mimeo)
4. "To A Maiden" - Crane (Mimeo)
5. "The Open Boat" - Crane (Adv. Comp.)

(Each student will read some of the following:)

6. Immigration:
   a. Introduction (Mimeo)
   b. Chart (Mimeo)
   c. "Flight from Famine In Ireland" (Mimeo)
   d. Perils of Crossing (Mimeo)
   e. Immigrant Views His Adjustment + (Mimeo)
   f. Carl Jensen becomes an American (Mimeo)
   g. Frizzle, Personal Narratives, 601-604

    h. John F. Kennedy, "Struggle for Americanization" - Frizzle, 605-606
7. *Only Yesterday* - Allen (Mimeo)
8. Sacco and Vanzetti Case:
    a. *Only Yesterday* - Allen (Mimeo)
    b. "Brickbats for Sacco and Vanzetti" - (Mimeo)
    c. "Vanzetti Condemns Judge Thayer" - (Mimeo)
    d. "Lippmann Pleads for Sacco and Vanzetti" - (Mimeo)
    e. *Winterset* - Anderson
9. The Ku Klux Klan:
    a. "The Klan's Fight for Americanism" (Mimeo)
    b. "The Long Hot Summer In Indiana" (Mimeo)
    c. "Letter Against The Klan" - White (Mimeo)
10. Immigration Restrictions:
    a. "The Unguarded Gate" - (Mimeo)
    b. "The Conflict Over Immigration Restriction"- (Mimeo)
    c. *The Uprooted* - Jandlin (Mimeo)

Bragdon: pp. 555 -
Bailey: pp. 766 - 770 - 773 - 797, 804 - 806

C. Film: "The Invisible Empire"

AMERICAN STUDIES OUTLINE

UNIT TWO: INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: FAILURE OR FULFILLMENT OF THE DREAM?

V. Week Nine - March 24 - April 1st

A. Subject: Response of the Government to the Complex Problems of an Advanced Industrial Society.

B. Readings:
1. The Financier - Dreiser (Mimeo)
2. "Lift Up Thine Eyes" - Anderson (C.A.P.)
3. "The Unknown Citizen" - Auden (Mimeo)
4. "Clean Curtains" - Sandburg (Newcomer)
5. "The Second Tree From The Corner" (Mimeo)
6. "Frescoes For Mr. Rockefeller's City" - (Mimeo)
7. "The Quest for the National Character" - Potter (Mimeo)
8. The Progressive Movement
    - a. "How The Other Half Lives" (Mimeo)
    - b. "Plunkett of Tammany Hall" (Mimeo)
    - c. "Jane Addams Establishes Hull House" (Mimeo)
    - d. "The Progressive Impulse: The Urban Scene (Mimeo)
    - e. "Revolt of the Cities" - (Mimeo)
    - f. "Shame of the Cities" Steffens (Mimeo)
    - g. The Progressive Movement - (Chapter 3)
    - h. Frizzle, 576 - 579
9. The Crisis of the Old Order
    - a. "The Happiest Man in the World" - Maltz (Mimeo)
    - b. "Will There Be A Revolution?" (Mimeo)
    - c. "From Farm To Shop To Relief" (Mimeo)
    - d. "Nomads of the Depression" (Mimeo)
    - e. "Crash" - (Mimeo)
    - f. "Rugged Individualism" - Hoover (Bragdon)
    - g. "Faces From The Past" (Mimeo)
    - h. The New Deal - (Chapter 1)
    - i. Frizzle, 670 - 681, 688 - 691
10. The Coming of the New Order:
    - a. "Commonwealth Club Speech" - F.D.R. (Mimeo)
    - b. "Henry A. Wallace Puts People Above Pigs" - (Mimeo)
    - c. "Norris Plays Down Electrical Power" (Mimeo)
    - d. "The New Deal" (Chapters 2 - 4)
    - e. Frizzle, 681 - 685, 692 - 702
    - f. Bragdon, 573 - 582, 585 - 610
    - g. Bailey, 818 - 826, 831 - 856

C. Films: "Life in the 30's"

UNIT TWO: INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY: FAILURE
OR FULFILLMENT OF THE DREAM? (continued - Page 2)

VI. Week Ten - April 8 - 11

  A. Subject: (Continuation of Week Nine)

  B. Readings:
    1. Daisy Miller - James
    2. Bragdon: 656 - 659, 660 - 662, 664 - 675, 679 - 682
    3. Bailey: 958 - 965, 966 - 968, 976 - 977, 980 - 989
    4. Increased Abundance and Government Action:
      a. Statistics (Mimeo)
      b. "Stevenson Favors More Spending" - (Mimeo)
      c. "Senator Goldwater Calls A Halt" - (Mimeo)
      d. "Liberty is at Stake" - Eisenhower (Mimeo)
      e. Frizzle, 708 - 713, 715 - 724
    5. The Generation Gap?
      a. Frizzle, 708, 714 - 715

  C. Lecture: "The Changing Status of Women"

  D. Film: "Edge of Abundance"

AMERICAN STUDIES OUTLINE

UNIT III: THE DREAM IN A REVOLUTIONARY WORLD

I. Week Eleven: April 14 - 18

A. Subject:
1. War I Hero: Idealism and Commitment-The Pre W.W.
2. Diplomacy in the Modern World: Case Studies 1898 - 1914

B. Readings:
1. "The American Boy" - T. Roosevelt (Mimeo)
2. "The Strenuous Life" - T. Roosevelt (Mimeo)
3. "A Message to Garcia" - Hubbard (Mimeo)
4. *Case Studies 1, 2, 3, 4
5. Frizzle, 610 - 625

*Instructions and readings for the Case Studies are to be found in the black notebook.

C. Composition: Theme V: The Hero

II. Week Twelve: April 21 - 25

A. Subject: (Continuation of Week Eleven)

B. Readings:
1. "Preparedness to the Soldier" - Wilson (Mimeo)
2. "Knoxville, Tennessee: Summer 1915" - Agee (Adv. Comp.)
3. Case Studies 5, 6
4. Frizzle, 629 - 648

C. Films:
1. "Innocent Years"
2. "The Great War"

III. Week Thirteen: April 28 - May 2

A. Subject:
1. The Post-World War I Hero: Disillusionment
2. Diplomacy in the Modern World: 1917 - 1941

B. Readings:
1. "Cambridge Ladies..." - Cummings (Mimeo)
2. "Patterns" - Lowell (New)
3. "In Another Country" - Hemingway (C.A.P.)
4. "Shield of Achilles" - Auden (Mimeo)
5. "Red, White, and Blue Thanksgiving" - Don Passos (C.A.P.)
6. Case Studies 7, 8, 9
7. Frizzle, 648 - 660

C. Films:
1. "Hemingway"

IV. Week Fourteen: May 5 - 9

A. Subject:
1. (Continuation of Week Thirteen)
2. Diplomacy in the Modern World: 1941 - 1945

B. Readings:
1. "Soldiers Home" - Hemingway (Mimeo)
2. "The Season 'Tis, My Lovely Lambs" - Cummings (Mimeo)
3. "Leader of the People" - Steinbeck (Mimeo)
4. "Portrait" - Cummings (Mimeo)
5. "Glamour Essay on 20th Century Hero"
6. Case Studies 10, 11, 12
7. Frizzle, 660 - 665

C. Film: 1. "High Noon"

D. Composition: Theme VI: On "High Noon"

V. Week Fifteen: May 12 - 16

A. Subject:
1. (Continuation of Week Thirteen)
2. Cold War Diplomacy: 1945 - Present

B. Readings:
1. The Great Gatsby - Fitzgerald
2. Case Studies 13, 14, 15
3. Frizzle, 742 - 745, 755 - 756, 757 - 761, 761 - 762, 747 - 749

C. Film: 1. "The Golden Twenties"

D. Lecture: Modern Art

VI. Week Sixteen: May 19 - 23

A. Subject:
1. (Continuation and Transition to the Contemporary Hero)
2. (Continuation of Week Fifteen)

B. Readings:
1. "Hollow Men" - Eliot (Mimeo)
2. "The Greatest Man in the World" - Thurber (Mimeo)
3. "Lindbergh Essay" (Mimeo)
4. "The Secret Life of Walter Mitty" - Thurber (Mimeo)
5. Case Studies 16, 17, 18
6. "Time Essay on the 20th Century Hero" (Mimeo)

C. Film: "Not So Long Ago"

D. Dramatic Production on Violence

VII. Week Seventeen: May 26 - 29

A. Subject:
1. The Contemporary Hero: Involvement and Commitment
2. (Continuation)

B. Readings:
1. "September 1, 1939" - Auden (Mimeo)
2. "The Debt Shall Be Paid" - Steinbeck (C.A.P.)
3. "For Esme, With Love and Squalor" - Salinger (Mimeo)
4. "An Interview with William Faulkner" (C.A.P.)
5. "Nobel Prize Speech" - Faulkner (C.A.P.)
6. Case Study 19
7. Frizzle, 763 - 783
8. Sevareid, "The American Dream" (Mimeo)

C. Lecture: "Modern Music Lecture"

APPENDIX B

Impact of New Ideas in Education: American Studies

A walk through the east wing of the third floor of the high school is like a walk through history in the making. Those who have made the trek have been greeted by a youthful Mark Twain expounding on riverboat psychology, felt the silencing rod in Jonathan Edwards' Puritan services, or found themselves cheering for a monarchy after hearing a 20th century Alexander Hamilton at a mock Constitutional Convention.

A Humanities Approach

Roger Williams isn't always found guilty of sedition for his urging of separation of church and state; the Civil War is avoided by wise diplomacy; and sometimes Woodrow Wilson wins his battle for the League of Nations.

Students may be found in large groups listening to a lecture, watching a movie or a play, following a debate between two teachers; or students may be in animated huddles of three to ten while a teacher confers with one or more in an adjoining conference room. And long after school hours students may be found engrossed in discussions of Hemingway, Faulkner, or caught by the exhilarating idea of Thoreau's "Civil Disobedience" and Transcendentalism.

A seance, a chorus, a jazz concert or even a strike may emanate from these third floor confines of the junior class. A senior who had been through the course remarked that "It's the games center that teaches you to think for yourself and see how everything is related."

IMPACT

OF NEW IDEAS
IN EDUCATION

VOL. V, NO. 1, 1968

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF

UNIVERSITY CITY, MISSOURI

AMERICAN STUDIES

. American History

. American Literature

A Climate for Learning

In trying to create a climate for more effective learning, the School District of University City, Missouri, is moving toward a new kind of school. The envisioned new kind of school is committed to personalizing education; to helping each child develop his unique character to become a citizen capable of making responsible decisions.

American Studies, introduced three years ago, represents one of our moves away from the traditional classroom. Described here are those movements in curricular content and method, teaching techniques and organization utilized in humanizing American history and literature.

Martin B. Garrison
Superintendent of Schools

Teachers team for a large group presentation.

One team member holds a seminar.

Teaching students to think for themselves and to understand the inseparability of American history and literature are the goals of American studies, originated by two University City teachers who convinced two more to join them.

In the summer of '64, armed with official approval, an allotment from a Ford Foundation School Improvement grant to the district, and the consulting services of Dr. Barry Karl and R. Judson Shaplin of Washington University, two English teachers and two history teachers began work on the now famous American Studies course. (Visitors from as far away as New Zealand and England have come to visit its classes, and a spokesman for the Kettering Foundation rated the course as being one of the reasons why University City was selected to become one of thirty-six I|D|E|A demonstration schools in the nation.)

Organization Changes

Concern with helping students develop skills of analysis and gain an understanding of the totality of the American experience were lofty aspirations that the group found not altogether simple to put into operation. A marriage of two subjects would require a complete change in organization and content. Safe habits and old routines had to be disrupted. American history, traditionally a senior subject, had to be moved into the junior curriculum. That curriculum had to be revised to show relationships and, incidentally, to meet the graduation requirements for English and history. No longer a study of chronology of dates and events and themes on unrelated topics, the new course focused on key eras and issues with composition assignments substantiating the student's views on those issues. Thus the English teacher became a resource person to a history project and a constant reminder that style and structure in presentation may not be forgotten outside of English class.

After 10 weeks of study, when one of the 225 students in the pilot program voiced the protest, "English 5 and social studies are so mixed together I can't separate them", he may not have realized that he had discovered the essence of the combined studies course, but there can be little doubt that he had received the message.

In a two-hour block of time five days a week bells were forgotten as discipline walls tumbled. Building walls came down with the disciplinary ones as the classrooms were converted to meet the needs of the new teaching teams and their classes. Each team of two teachers — one English and one history teacher — were given one large room with a folding partition and a small private conference room making it possible for the team to divide their 50 to 55 students into any type of grouping desired during the class period. The lecture hall and the auditorium were available for still larger meeting rooms if several teams wished to meet all their students together for a large group lecture, film, art or drama presentation. Small groups or an individual might be allowed to spend class time on independent study in the library. Nor were activities restricted to the high school building. Studies were expanded to include showings at movie and legitimate theatres, tours of the art museum, and for some group visits to Hannibal to view the setting for Mark Twain's famous works.

Solving the problems of time and space were simple compared with the intricacies of devising a workable program of correlated themes from history and literature, simultaneously interweaving art, architecture, music and philosophy. Making the humanities manageable became the chief concern that first summer when the two teams drew up early course outlines. The course has continued to be the subject of revision now that six teams and the entire junior class of more than 600 have become involved in the study.

Content Based on Issues

Selecting the nebulous, but all inclusive themes of the American dream and the American character, the teachers began the task of collecting materials which would provide the students with an intellectual reliving of

Role playing is an important facet of American Studies. Here students hold

a mock trial

a seance

a Puritan church service

the problems and choices in the turning points in American life. How better to understand a man's viewpoint than to study his own words? Who better than William Bradford, leader of that first pilgrimage on the Mayflower and of the colony at Plymouth, could tell of the "Mayflower Compact" as he did in his writing **Of Plimouth Plantation?** Who could be a better authority on the principle of the separation of the church and state than that early dissenter Roger Williams, who was expelled from Massachusetts for his seditious talk as evidenced in his writing of "The Bloody Tenet of Persecution?" Putting the student's feet in such historical shoes could be done only by relying on documents and first-hand accounts. Unfortunately, no one text was available that contained all the information desired. Thus began the culling of dozens of texts and other publications to collect those items which would present a depth study of the units selected. These items were mimeographed and assimilated in the famous black notebooks. The use of loose-leaf notebooks makes it possible to add or subtract materials, should emphasis be switched to new issues or if supplementary assignments should be desired for independent study. Often referred to as the 'post hole' technique, the course vignettes the philosophy behind the decisions made in seven turning points in history and the frame of reference of those who made the decisions in the American experience rather than presenting a historical survey.

Establishment of the American Dream

In the first topic, focus is on the establishment of the American dream and the basic conflict of authority versus the individual as shown through the study of the wealth of Puritan writings and trials.

The American Studies Choir of student volunteers presents a music program for all junior classes.

The dream is redefined in the 18th and early 19th centuries with the autobiographical writings of Jonathan Edwards and Benjamin Franklin offering the opposite poles, from the strictest Puritan thinking to the rise of the pragmatist. This era culminates in Unit II when the debates between the colonies and England switch to the states and the new central government under the

Tapes of speeches may be replayed during release time.

(Photos by American Studies student Mark Zuki)

development of the American constitution. An experiment in drawing up a constitution and Bill of Rights came as classes set up mock conventions. Each student played the role of an early representative to those first constitutional congresses after having extensively researched that delegate's stand. The conflict for national or local control of the new government is presented through such admirable protagonists as the Royalist, Hamilton, and the first democrat, Thomas Jefferson.

In Unit III, the dream is expanded through the westward movement as explained in the "Turner Thesis" and **The Hero and the People,** a portrait of Andrew Jackson and the practical affairs of the spreading democracy. With this movement comes a new spirit in literature and art called Romanticism shown through the works of Washington Irving, William Cullen Bryant and James Fenimore Cooper, and with the transcendentalists Emerson and Thoreau who present romantic concepts of humanity. In Thoreau's "Civil Disobedience" the seeds of today's protests were found as students attempted to answer Thoreau's premise that a man has the right to disobey the law if the law conflicts with the man's own conscience.

Dilemma of Minorities

The last topic of the first semester centered on the challenge that American slavery presents to the American dream of democracy based upon the tenets that "all men are created equal." A wide selection of conflicting reports from the writings of ex-slaves, speeches by President Lincoln and various congressmen, and excerpts from several texts give background for essay on how Negro life changed when slavery ended, or if it changed. During the third year of the program a teacher from one team and one from another elected to debate the slavery question from the views of a pre-Civil War Mr. Slaveholder and a Yankee abolitionist. When Mr. Slaveholder claimed as an argument for Negro contentment the colored man's singing, a heretofore seemingly disinterested student leaped up and shouted, "But Mr. Slaveholder, did you ever listen to the words?" Then he proceeded to sing "Old Black Joe."

The second semester's work was prepared during weekly team meetings during that first year, further improvised during the second year and thoroughly revised the third summer of (1967) when all six teams concentrated on the final semester. A number of optional readings were worked out in order that materials would be available at several ability levels.

Students consider the deferment of the American dream, particularly for the Negro in **The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn.** They question the survival of the dream itself with the rise of industrialism as they read the fears expressed by such Populists as Bryan or a muckraking progressive like Steffens. Nor are fears assuaged in the disillusionment of **The Great Gatsby** and the desolation in **The Grapes of Wrath,** but there's optimism in the New Deal and the Great Society. Finally, the rise of America as an international power includes a survey of conflicting concepts of the hero as presented by Theodore Roosevelt, Ernest Hemingway, Woodrow Wilson, Charles A. Lindbergh, James Thurber, William Faulkner, Ho Chi Minh, or movie star Gary Cooper.

Evaluation of the Approach

After three years, American Studies can be best judged by its alumni. Comments from former students include such statements as: "It's the only course that really offered a challenge," from an honor student, to "I never really understood about concepts before, but when you play like you are really one of those people on the scene, then you know how management feels or that laborers have to have rights," from a less able student.

Teachers admit they have learned as much as the students and believe they are performing better under the added stimulation of interchange with professional teammates. Weekly meetings of all the teams foster growth and direction in the presentation of the alternatives of conflict. Art and music consultants add authority and understanding in rounding out the humanities approach.

In an informal survey, both teachers and students expressed favor for the new program which relies on knowledge of literature and research evidence rather than custom or myth. Teachers feel the added preparation time to provide alternate assignments and the guidance in directing several students independently is justified by the values the students receive in making independent judgements. Since groupings vary daily from homogeneous to heterogeneous, large, small or individual, teaching teams try to reach and stimulate every student. The student reaction is summed up by a senior, who said, "American Studies teachers seem to know their students better than other teachers."

"We try to teach them what it means to be an American and how to be an American through participation in democratic activities", was a teacher's summation of the content of the inter-disciplinary course.

IMPACT
Published by the School District of University City
640 Harvard Avenue
University City, Missouri, 63130
Superintendent—Dr. Martin B. Garrison

THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL IS AN
DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL
IDEA
Principal—DR. MARK A. BOYER
Project Director—RONALD M. COMPTON
Teacher Writer—Max Balcom

APPENDIX C

Watson Analysis Schedule

WATSON ANALYSIS SCHEDULE

Elizabeth P. Watson
University of Missouri - St. Louis

FORM A

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of 213 items designed to sample your opinions about given classroom procedures. The inventory is divided into three parts: (1) What students are *told* they are expected to do, (2) What students are *actually* expected to do, and (3) What students *actually do*. Each part contains directions for responding to that set of items. Be sure to read the directions carefully before responding to any of the items. When you have finished one part, go on to the next page.

Work as fast as possible. Since this is an individual matter, there are no right or wrong answers. Therefore, you should mark your first reaction to an item and then continue directly to the next item.

Do not write on this booklet. You are to mark your answers on a separate sheet which contains spaces for five responses per item. Be sure that you record your choice in the appropriate position. This inventory will be machine scored. Therefore, you are to use the pencil which has been provided to record your responses.

The items in this inventory consist of possible types of students' behaviors in a classroom setting.

If you are VERY SURE that the statement is true, blacken the space under "A"	■	B	C	D	E
If you are SOMEWHAT SURE that the statement is true, blacken the space under "B"	A	■	C	D	E
If you are UNDECIDED or UNCERTAIN whether or not the statement is true, blacken the space under "C"	A	B	■	D	E
If you are SOMEWHAT SURE that the statement is not true, blacken the space under "D"	A	B	C	■	E
If you are VERY SURE that the statement is not true, blacken the space under "E"	A	B	C	D	■

PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY ITEM

For Experimental Use Only

PART I. WHAT STUDENTS ARE TOLD TO DO. Teachers generally tell students that certain types of behavior will be expected of them during a given course of instruction. Rate the correctness with which the following statements complete the sentence:

IN THIS CLASS, STUDENTS ARE TOLD THAT THEY ARE EXPECTED TO . . .

---

1. read from a required textbook.
2. use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.
3. help decide what is to be studied.
4. detect bias.
5. let the teacher decide what is to be studied.
6. suggest methods, materials, activities, etc. for studying.
7. select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.
8. study problems identified by the teacher.
9. select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.
10. study problems by following steps directed by the teacher.
11. develop their own methods of studying problems.
12. remember the names of men, places, events and dates.
13. be able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their studies.
14. remember the ideas and beliefs of great men.
15. recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.
16. discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.
17. discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.
18. believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.
19. question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.
20. make reports on assigned topics using encyclopaedias or similar sources.
21. be able to tell fact from opinion.
22. make reports or summarize their findings from studying a problem of their own choice.
23. define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.
24. ask questions of the teacher and answer question from the teacher, largely from memory, on the assigned textbook, lectures or subject matter.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

IN THIS CLASS STUDENTS ARE TOLD THAT THEY ARE EXPECTED TO . . .

25. actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.

26. draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.

27. draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.

28. let the teacher do most of the talking.

29. do most of the talking.

30. call attention to confused or unrelated statements made by the teacher.

31. listen to the teacher give lectures.

32. listen attentively to each other.

33. try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.

34. take notes from teacher lectures.

35. record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.

36. be responsible for remembering facts found in the textbook or teacher lectures.

37. get more facts than the textbook has when the facts are needed to understand basic problems.

38. be evaluated only on test scores and require written work.

39. be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.

40. all be evaluated on the same basis.

41. be evaluated on an individual basis.

42. evaluate their own progress.

43. be evaluated on the amount of information they remember.

44. be evaluated on their ability in handling information to identify and solve problems.

45. suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.

46. suggest procedures for getting information.

47. decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.

48. decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.

49. use facts to support or reject ideas.

50. try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.

51. try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.

52. learn how to make decisions in the real world.

53. learn how to recognize human social problems.

54. learn how to attack or solve social problems.

55. learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.

56. satisfy graduation requirements because of what is learned in class.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

STUDENTS ARE TOLD THAT THEY ARE EXPECTED TO . . .

57. be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.

58. look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.

59. change the way they behave in society because of what is learned in class.

60. understand human society because of what is learned in class.

61. understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.

62. learn the facts that they will need once they get out of school.

63. continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.

64. enjoy what they are doing.

65. make decisions that really matter.

66. study things that are useful only in school.

67. speak frankly in class.

68. believe that the teacher accepts them for what they are.

69. believe that the teacher understands them.

70. do unimportant tasks.

71. be interested in what is being studied.

GO TO PART II.

PART II. WHAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO DO. Teachers generally expect certain types of behavior from students during a given course of instruction. Rate the correctness with which the following statements complete the sentence:

IT IS MY OPINION THAT IN THIS CLASS STUDENTS ARE ACTUALLY EXPECTED TO . . .

---

72. read from a required textbook.

73. use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.

74. help decide what is to be studied.

75. detect bias.

76. let the teacher decide what is to be studied.

77. suggest methods, materials, activities, etc. for studying.

78. select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.

79. study problems identified by the teacher.

80. select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.

81. study problems by following steps directed by the teacher.

82. develop their own methods of studying problems.

83. remember the names, places events and dates.

84. be able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their studies.

85. remember the ideas and beliefs of great men.

86. recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.

87. discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.

88. discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.

89. believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.

90. question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.

91. make reports on assigned topics using encyclopaedias or similar sources.

92. be able to tell fact from opinion.

93. make reports or summarize their findings from studying a problem of their own choice.

94. define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.

95. ask questions of the teacher and answer questions from the teacher, largely from memory, on the assigned textbook, lectures or subject matter.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

STUDENTS ARE ACTUALLY EXPECTED TO . . .

96. actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.

97. draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.

98. draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.

99. let the teacher do most of the talking.

100. do most of the talking.

101. call attention to confused or unrelated statements made by the teacher.

102. listen to the teacher give lectures.

103. listen attentively to each other.

104. try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.

105. take notes from teacher lectures.

106. record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.

107. be responsible for remembering facts found in the textbook or teacher lectures.

108. get more facts than the textbook has when the facts are needed to understand basic problems.

109. be evaluated only on test scores and required written work.

110. be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.

111. all be evaluated on the same basis.

112. be evaluated on an individual basis.

113. evaluate their own progress.

114. be evaluated on the amount of information they remember.

115. be evaluated on their ability in handling information to identify and solve problems.

116. suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.

117. suggest procedures for getting information.

118. decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.

119. decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.

120. use facts to support or reject ideas.

121. try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.

122. try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.

123. learn how to make decisions in the real world.

124. learn how to recognize human social problems.

125. learn how to attack or solve social problems.

126. learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

STUDENTS ARE ACTUALLY EXPECTED TO . . .

STUDENTS ARE ACTUALLY EXPECTED TO . . .

127. satisfy graduation requirements because of what is learned in class.

128. be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.

129. look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.

130. change the way they behave in society because of what is learned in class.

131. understand human society because of what is learned in class.

132. understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.

133. learn the facts that they will need once they get out of school.

134. continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.

135. enjoy what they are doing.

136. make decisions that really matter.

137. study things that are useful only in school.

138. speak frankly in class.

139. believe that the teacher accepts them for what they are.

140. believe that the teacher understands them.

141. do unimportant tasks.

142. be interested in what is being studied.

GO TO PART III.

PART III. WHAT STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO. Students generally exhibit certain behavior during a given course of instruction. Rate the correctness with which the following statements complete the sentence:

IT IS MY OPINION THAT IN THIS CLASS STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO (ARE) . . .

---

143. read from a required textbook.

144. use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.

145. help decide what is to be studied.

146. detect bias.

147. let the teacher decide what is to be studied.

148. suggest methods, materials, activities, etc. for studying.

149. select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.

150. study problems identified by the teacher.

151. select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.

152. study problems by following steps directed by the teacher.

153. develop their own method of studying problems.

154. remember the names of men, places, events and dates.

155. able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their own studies.

156. remember the ideas and beliefs of great men.

157. recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.

STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO (ARE) . . .

158. discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.

159. discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.

160. believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.

161. question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.

162. make reports on assigned topics using encyclopaedias or similar sources.

163. able to tell fact from opinion.

164. make reports or summarize their own findings from studying a problem of their own choice.

165. define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.

166. ask questions of the teacher and answer questions from the teacher, largely from memory, on the assigned textbook, lectures or subject matter.

167. actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.

168. draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO (ARE) . . .

169. draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.

170. let the teacher do most of the talking.

171. do most of the talking.

172. call attention to confused or unrelated statements made by the teacher.

173. listen to the teacher give lectures.

174. listen attentively to each other.

175. try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.

176. take notes from teacher lectures.

177. record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.

178. responsible for remembering facts found in the textbook or teacher lectures.

179. get more facts than the textbook has when the facts are needed to understand basic problems.

180. evaluated only on test scores and required written work.

181. evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.

182. all evaluated on the same basis.

183. evaluated on an individual basis.

184. evaluate their own progress.

185. evaluated on the amount of information they remember.

STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO (ARE) . . .

186. be evaluated on their ability in handling information to identify and solve problems.

187. suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.

188. suggest procedures for getting information.

189. decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.

190. decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.

191. use facts to support or reject ideas.

192. try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.

193. try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.

194. learn how to make decisions in the real world.

195. learn how to recognize human social problems.

196. learn how to attack or solve social problems.

197. learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.

198. satisfy graduation requirements because of what is learned in class.

199. better citizens because of what is learned in class.

200. look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.

201. change the way they behave in society because of what is learned in class.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.

STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO (ARE) . . .

202. understand human society because of what is learned in class.

203. understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.

204. learn the facts that they will need once they get out of school.

205. continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.

206. enjoy what they are doing.

207. make decisions that really matter.

208. study things that are useful only in school.

209. speak frankly in class.

210. believe that the teacher accepts them for what they are.

211. believe that the teacher understands them.

212. do unimportant tasks.

213. interested in what is being studied.

APPENDIX D

WAS Answer Sheet

School Number: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

Teacher Number: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 / 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Student Teacher ☐

Form: A B C D E

STUDENT NUMBER											
1		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Name ______

School ______

Teacher ______

1 A B C D E 2 A B C D E 3 A B C D E 4 A B C D E 5 A B C D E 6 A B C D E 7 A B C D E 8 A B C D E
9 A B C D E 10 A B C D E 11 A B C D E 12 A B C D E 13 A B C D E 14 A B C D E 15 A B C D E 16 A B C D E
17 A B C D E 18 A B C D E 19 A B C D E 20 A B C D E 21 A B C D E 22 A B C D E 23 A B C D E 24 A B C D E
25 A B C D E 26 A B C D E 27 A B C D E 28 A B C D E 29 A B C D E 30 A B C D E 31 A B C D E 32 A B C D E
33 A B C D E 34 A B C D E 35 A B C D E 36 A B C D E 37 A B C D E 38 A B C D E 39 A B C D E 40 A B C D E
41 A B C D E 42 A B C D E 43 A B C D E 44 A B C D E 45 A B C D E 46 A B C D E 47 A B C D E 48 A B C D E
49 A B C D E 50 A B C D E 51 A B C D E 52 A B C D E 53 A B C D E 54 A B C D E 55 A B C D E 56 A B C D E
57 A B C D E 58 A B C D E 59 A B C D E 60 A B C D E 61 A B C D E 62 A B C D E 63 A B C D E 64 A B C D E
65 A B C D E 66 A B C D E 67 A B C D E 68 A B C D E 69 A B C D E 70 A B C D E 71 A B C D E 72 A B C D E
73 A B C D E 74 A B C D E 75 A B C D E 76 A B C D E 77 A B C D E 78 A B C D E 79 A B C D E 80 A B C D E
81 A B C D E 82 A B C D E 83 A B C D E 84 A B C D E 85 A B C D E 86 A B C D E 87 A B C D E 88 A B C D E
89 A B C D E 90 A B C D E 91 A B C D E 92 A B C D E 93 A B C D E 94 A B C D E 95 A B C D E 96 A B C D E
97 A B C D E 98 A B C D E 99 A B C D E 100 A B C D E 101 A B C D E 102 A B C D E 103 A B C D E 104 A B C D E
105 A B C D E 106 A B C D E 107 A B C D E 108 A B C D E 109 A B C D E 110 A B C D E 111 A B C D E 112 A B C D E
113 A B C D E 114 A B C D E 115 A B C D E 116 A B C D E 117 A B C D E 118 A B C D E 119 A B C D E 120 A B C D E
121 A B C D E 122 A B C D E 123 A B C D E 124 A B C D E 125 A B C D E 126 A B C D E 127 A B C D E 128 A B C D E
129 A B C D E 130 A B C D E 131 A B C D E 132 A B C D E 133 A B C D E 134 A B C D E 135 A B C D E 136 A B C D E
137 A B C D E 138 A B C D E 139 A B C D E 140 A B C D E 141 A B C D E 142 A B C D E 143 A B C D E 144 A B C D E
145 A B C D E 146 A B C D E 147 A B C D E 148 A B C D E 149 A B C D E 150 A B C D E 151 A B C D E 152 A B C D E
153 A B C D E 154 A B C D E 155 A B C D E 156 A B C D E 157 A B C D E 158 A B C D E 159 A B C D E 160 A B C D E
161 A B C D E 162 A B C D E 163 A B C D E 164 A B C D E 165 A B C D E 166 A B C D E 167 A B C D E 168 A B C D E
169 A B C D E 170 A B C D E 171 A B C D E 172 A B C D E 173 A B C D E 174 A B C D E 175 A B C D E 176 A B C D E
177 A B C D E 178 A B C D E 179 A B C D E 180 A B C D E 181 A B C D E 182 A B C D E 183 A B C D E 184 A B C D E
185 A B C D E 186 A B C D E 187 A B C D E 188 A B C D E 189 A B C D E 190 A B C D E 191 A B C D E 192 A B C D E
193 A B C D E 194 A B C D E 195 A B C D E 196 A B C D E 197 A B C D E 198 A B C D E 199 A B C D E 200 A B C D E
201 A B C D E 202 A B C D E 203 A B C D E 204 A B C D E 205 A B C D E 206 A B C D E 207 A B C D E 208 A B C D E
209 A B C D E 210 A B C D E 211 A B C D E 212 A B C D E 213 A B C D E 214 A B C D E 215 A B C D E 216 A B C D E

PS-271-UM
Prtd. by PennScan Forms Inc., Phila., Pa.

APPENDIX E

Tables, Rotated Factor Solutions

TABLE 54

Teachers' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ep	1	.695	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.515	n.s.	n.s.
	2	.272	n.s.	n.s.	-.612	n.s.	n.s.	.298
	3	.568	n.s.	.301	-.254	n.s.	n.s.	.445
	4	.787	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	5	.821	n.s.	-.230	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	6	.539	n.s.	n.s.	-.375	-.527	n.s.	.268
	7	.323	n.s.	.254	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.611
	8	.638	.345	n.s.	n.s.	-.290	n.s.	.227
	9	.810	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	10	.523	n.s.	.429	.309	n.s.	-.396	n.s.
	11	.547	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.528	n.s.	n.s.
	12	.517	.278	n.s.	n.s.	-.414	-.276	.243
C1	1	n.s.	.719	.279	n.s.	n.s.	-.236	n.s.
	2	n.s.	.643	n.s.	n.s.	-.368	n.s.	n.s.
	3	n.s.	.539	.259	n.s.	-.528	-.244	n.s.
	4	.619	.363	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	5	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.233	.676
	6	.367	.707	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.253	n.s.
	7	n.s.	.311	.388	-.501	-.302	n.s.	n.s.
	8	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.719	n.s.	n.s.
C2	1	.570	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.246	-.358	.278
	2	n.s.	.341	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.627
	3	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.755	.336
	4	.621	.306	n.s.	-.245	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	5	.694	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	6	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.751	n.s.	-.326	n.s.
	7	.772	n.s.	.224	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	8	n.s.	n.s.	.370	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.643
	9	n.s.	n.s.	.779	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Significance defined as $\geq .220$

TABLE 55

Teachers' Perceptions of Actual Expectations: WAS, Part II; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
EP	1	.390	n.s.	-.697	n.s.	-.349	n.s.	n.s.
	2	n.s.	n.s.	-.416	n.s.	-.622	n.s.	-.266
	3	n.s.	n.s.	-.523	n.s.	-.507	n.s.	n.s.
	4	.757	n.s.	-.449	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	5	.840	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.258	n.s.	n.s.
	6	n.s.	n.s.	-.666	n.s.	-.408	.227	n.s.
	7	.233	-.067	-.270	.074	-.567	.437	n.s.
	8	.311	-.212	-.529	n.s.	-.503	n.s.	n.s.
	9	n.s.	n.s.	-.432	n.s.	-.663	n.s.	n.s.
	10	n.s.	n.s.	-.289	-.585	-.319	.360	n.s.
	11	.224	n.s.	-.522	n.s.	-.681	n.s.	n.s.
	12	n.s.	n.s.	-.634	-.320	-.323	n.s.	n.s.
C1	1	.459	-.582	n.s.	-.284	n.s.	.248	n.s.
	2	n.s.	-.645	-.396	n.s.	n.s.	.220	n.s.
	3	n.s.	-.473	-.529	n.s.	n.s.	.442	n.s.
	4	.511	-.221	-.262	n.s.	-.463	n.s.	n.s.
	5	n.s.	n.s.	-.604	n.s.	n.s.	.468	n.s.
	6	.623	n.s.	-.470	n.s.	-.252	n.s.	n.s.
	7	n.s.	-.618	n.s.	n.s.	-.565	n.s.	-.254
	8	n.s.	-.853	n.s.	.226	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
C2	1	.225	-.340	-.734	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	2	.390	-.328	-.439	n.s.	-.300	.223	n.s.
	3	n.s.	n.s.	-.292	n.s.	n.s.	.775	n.s.
	4	.410	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.680	n.s.	n.s.
	5	n.s.	n.s.	-.298	-.340	-.515	n.s.	.227
	6	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.809	n.s.	.313	n.s.
	7	.275	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.806	n.s.	n.s.
	8	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.229	n.s.
	9	n.s.	-.326	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.689	n.s.

Significance defined as ≥ .220

TABLE 56

Teachers' Perceptions of Realized Expectations: WAS, Part III; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Ep	1	.303	n.s.	-.264	.489	.362	n.s.	.273	-.293	n.s.
	2	.781	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.283
	3	.778	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.264	n.s.
	4	n.s.	-.571	n.s.	.367	-.257	-.382	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	5	.234	n.s.	-.543	.482	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.223	n.s.
	6	.606	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.395	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	7	.665	n.s.	-.224	n.s.	n.s.	-.259	.235	n.s.	n.s.
	8	.460	n.s.	-.494	n.s.	n.s.	-.234	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	9	.482	n.s.	n.s.	.451	.233	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	10	.823	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	11	.646	n.s.	n.s.	.370	n.s.	n.s.	-.240	n.s.	-.238
	12	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.779	n.s.	-.261	n.s.	n.s.
C1	1	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.763	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.395	n.s.
	2	.243	n.s.	n.s.	.722	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.231
	3	n.s.	.308	n.s.	n.s.	.394	-.234	n.s.	.432	n.s.
	4	n.s.	.466	-.227	n.s.	.274	n.s.	n.s.	.441	n.s.
	5	n.s.	.837	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	6	n.s.	n.s.	-.403	n.s.	n.s.	-.731	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	7	.406	.235	n.s.	.417	n.s.	.229	n.s.	.522	n.s.
	8	.235	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.268	n.s.	n.s.	.696	.289
C2	1	.233	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.713	-.318	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	2	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.243	-.635	.327	n.s.	.278
	3	.468	.546	n.s.	n.s.	.231	-.358	.323	n.s.	n.s.
	4	n.s.	n.s.	-.830	n.s.	.220	n.s.	n.s.	.273	n.s.
	5	n.s.	n.s.	-.722	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	6	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.823
	7	.290	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.776	n.s.	n.s.
	8	n.s.	.282	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.778	n.s.
	9	n.s.	.507	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.453

Significance defined as ≥ .220

TABLE 57

Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part I; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ep	1	.221	-.572	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.228	n.s.
	2	n.s.	-.540	n.s.	.529	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	3	.234	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.797	n.s.
	4	.577	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.317	n.s.
	5	n.s.	-.563	n.s.	n.s.	.248	n.s.	n.s.
	6	.399	-.594	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	7	n.s.	-.614	n.s.	.421	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	8	.292	-.399	n.s.	.312	.369	n.s.	n.s.
	9	.312	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.416	n.s.	n.s.
	10	n.s.	-.395	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	11	n.s.	-.676	n.s.	.302	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	12	.242	-.501	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	13	n.s.	-.684	n.s.	.222	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	14	n.s.	-.751	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	15	n.s.	-.597	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	16	.434	-.343	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	17	n.s.	-.785	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	18	n.s.	-.431	n.s.	.582	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	19	n.s.	-.687	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	20	n.s.	-.809	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	21	.278	-.564	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	22	.397	-.362	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.250	n.s.
	23	n.s.	-.702	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	24	n.s.	-.662	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	25	.435	-.552	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	26	.330	-.559	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.240
	27	.289	-.227	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	28	.255	-.314	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	29	.416	-.508	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	30	.242	-.466	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

TABLE 57 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C1	31	n.s.	-.388	n.s.	.239	n.s.	n.s.	-.310
	32	.462	-.371	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	33	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	34	.227	n.s.	n.s.	.258	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	35	.496	-.247	n.s.	.229	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	36	.437	n.s.	n.s.	.441	.310	n.s.	n.s.
	37	.319	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.252
	38	n.s.	n.s.	.811	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	39	n.s.	-.287	n.s.	.309	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	40	.238	-.240	n.s.	n.s.	.239	n.s.	n.s.
	41	.349	n.s.	.365	n.s.	-.317	n.s.	n.s.
	42	.358	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	43	.235	n.s.	n.s.	.252	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	44	.298	-.222	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.690
	45	.249	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	46	n.s.	-.236	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	47	.315	-.368	.287	n.s.	n.s.	.244	n.s.
	48	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	49	.366	n.s	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.301
	50	.362	-.324	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	51	.660	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	52	.269	-.293	n.s.	.361	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	53	.441	-.231	n.s.	.243	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	54	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	55	n.s.	-.413	n.s.	n.s.	.471	.237	n.s.
	56	.435	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	57	.223	-.337	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	58	.522	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	59	n.s.	-.324	n.s.	.308	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	60	n.s.	-.226	.290	.221	.428	-.221	n.s.

TABLE 57 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Teachers)	Factors						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	61	n.s.	-.566	.281	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	62	.819	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	63	.534	n.s.	.221	.332	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	64	n.s.	-.490	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	65	.772	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	66	.740	n.s.	.310	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	67	.254	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	68	.515	-.232	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	69	.322	n.s.	n.s.	.757	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	70	.330	-.373	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	71	.693	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	72	.840	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	73	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.780	n.s.	n.s.
	74	.243	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.262	n.s.
C2	75	.408	-.345	.461	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	76	.620	n.s.	.235	n.s.	.229	n.s.	n.s.
	77	.687	-.278	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	78	.681	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	79	.627	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	80	.587	-.265	n.s.	.313	.252	n.s.	n.s.
	81	.739	-.243	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	82	.402	-.245	n.s.	.658	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	83	.796	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	84	.543	n.s.	n.s.	.611	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	85	.714	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	86	.745	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.227	n.s.
	87	.765	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	88	.510	n.s.	n.s.	.340	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	89	.674	n.s.	n.s.	.276	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	90	.395	n.s.	n.s.	.325	n.s.	.293	n.s.

Significance defined as ≥ .220

TABLE 58

Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part II; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Students)	Factors						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ep	1	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	2	n.s.	.336	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	3	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.825	n.s.	n.s.
	4	.498	n.s.	n.s.	.422	-.282	n.s.	n.s.
	5	n.s.	.356	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	6	.498	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	7	n.s.	.605	n.s.	.306	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	8	n.s.	.238	n.s.	.273	-.366	n.s.	n.s.
	9	.301	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	10	n.s.	.414	-.341	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	11	n.s.	.753	n.s.	n.s.	-.239	.222	n.s.
	12	.289	.396	n.s.	n.s.	-.367	n.s.	n.s.
	13	n.s.	.387	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	14	n.s.	.823	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	15	.367	n.s.	-.220	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.256
	16	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.354	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	17	n.s.	.319	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	18	n.s.	.368	n.s.	.371	n.s.	.582	n.s.
	19	n.s.	.478	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	20	n.s.	.480	-.389	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	21	.377	.270	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.619	n.s.
	22	.418	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	23	n.s.	.614	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.230	n.s.
	24	n.s.	.354	-.294	n.s.	-.317	n.s.	n.s.
	25	.632	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	26	n.s.	.222	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.235	n.s.
	27	.434	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.468	n.s.
	28	.393	n.s.	n.s.	.283	-.311	n.s.	n.s.
	29	.552	.286	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.257
	30	n.s.	.322	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

TABLE 58 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students)	Factors						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C1	31	n.s.	.400	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	32	.556	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.266	n.s.
	33	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.815
	34	.452	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	35	.491	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	36	.581	.381	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	37	.477	.265	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.337
	38	.225	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	39	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.297	.493	.305
	40	.457	.315	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.270
	41	.222	n.s.	-.786	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	42	.448	n.s.	n.s.	.415	-.481	.278	n.s.
	43	.348	.322	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.521	.224
	44	.236	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	45	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	46	.220	.342	n.s.	n.s.	-.341	n.s.	n.s.
	47	.520	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	48	.227	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	49	.284	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	50	.271	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.244	n.s.	n.s.
	51	.739	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	52	.408	.501	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	53	.533	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.235	.295	n.s.
	54	.383	n.s.	-.293	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.320
	55	.254	.391	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	56	.330	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.400	.306	n.s.
	57	n.s.	.245	n.s.	n.s.	-.355	n.s.	n.s.
	58	.276	.256	n.s.	n.s.	-.338	n.s.	.494
	59	.273	.396	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	60	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.238	n.s.	n.s.

TABLE 58 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students)	Factors						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C2	61	n.s.	n.s.	-.249	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	62	.772	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	63	.545	n.s.	-.277	.225	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	64	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	65	.809	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	66	.544	.240	n.s.	n.s.	.223	n.s.	n.s.
	67	.301	.270	n.s.	.206	n.s.	.463	n.s.
	68	.492	n.s.	-.460	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	69	.321	.254	n.s.	.675	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	70	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	71	.826	.223	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	72	n.s.	.240	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	73	.520	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.241
	74	.250	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.234	n.s.	n.s.
	75	.379	.405	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	76	.690	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	77	.679	n.s.	n.s.	.264	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	78	.695	n.s.	n.s.	.307	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	79	.581	n.s.	-.341	n.s.	n.s.	.232	-.208
	80	.481	.347	n.s.	.281	n.s.	.242	n.s.
	81	.716	.214	n.s.	.268	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	82	.337	.461	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	83	.604	n.s.	-.304	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	84	.237	.220	n.s.	.308	n.s.	.228	n.s.
	85	.812	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	86	.389	n.s.	n.s.	.671	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	87	.832	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	88	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	89	.685	n.s.	n.s.	.289	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	90	.429	.241	-.309	n.s.	-.220	n.s.	n.s.

Significance defined as ≥ .220

TABLE 59

Students' Perceptions of Explicit Expectations: WAS, Part III; Direction of Significant Factor Loadings for Rotated Factor Solution

Programs	Variables (Students)	Factors						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	1	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.367	-.618	n.s.	n.s.
	2	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	3	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.292	-.304	n.s.	.308
	4	.581	.320	.252	n.s.	n.s.	-.227	n.s.
	5	.326	.316	n.s.	n.s.	-.275	n.s.	n.s.
	6	.375	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	7	.537	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.278	-.280	n.s.
	8	n.s.	.244	n.s.	n.s.	-.380	-.504	n.s.
	9	.493	n.s.	n.s.	.322	n.s.	n.s.	.219
	10	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.857	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	11	n.s.	n.s.	.242	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	12	.516	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	13	.748	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	14	n.s.	.347	n.s.	n.s.	-.242	n.s.	.228
EP	15	.574	.237	n.s.	n.s.	-.208	n.s.	n.s.
	16	.520	n.s.	n.s.	.426	n.s.	-.341	n.s.
	17	.255	.211	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.644	n.s.
	18	.293	.427	n.s.	.288	n.s.	-.382	n.s.
	19	n.s.	.297	.240	n.s.	-.457	-.235	n.s.
	20	.324	.406	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.222
	21	.601	n.s.	n.s.	.317	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	22	.597	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	23	.408	n.s.	n.s.	.440	-.229	n.s.	n.s.
	24	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.445	-.370	.221
	25	.309	n.s.	.230	.420	n.s.	-.346	n.s.
	26	.233	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.207	n.s.	n.s.
	27	.451	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.250	n.s.
	28	.340	n.s.	.235	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	29	.218	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.789	n.s.
	30	.666	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

TABLE 59 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students)	Factors						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C1	31	.331	.290	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	32	.671	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	33	.235	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s	n.s.	n.s.
	34	.244	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.306	-.297	n.s.
	35	.646	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	36	.400	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.284	n.s.	n.s.
	37	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.446	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	38	.265	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	39	n.s.	.444	.230	n.s.	.283	n.s.	.246
	40	.250	.262	.714	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	41	.363	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.233	n.s.	.289
	42	.236	n.s.	.264	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.246
	43	.429	.382	n.s.	n.s.	-.291	n.s.	n.s.
	44	.269	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.768
	45	.446	.285	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	46	.568	n.s.	.287	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.231
	47	.549	n.s.	n.s.	.243	n.s.	n.s.	.492
	48	.276	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	49	.554	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	50	.464	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.295	n.s.
	51	.724	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	52	.410	.311	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.373	n.s.
	53	.502	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	54	.438	.243	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	55	n.s.	n.s.	.533	n.s.	-.322	n.s.	n.s.
	56	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.473	n.s.
	57	.498	n.s.	.269	.227	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	58	.305	.759	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	59	n.s.	.541	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	60	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

TABLE 59 (continued)

Programs	Variables (Students)	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C2	61	n.s.	.228	n.s.	n.s.	-.717	n.s.	n.s.
	62	.779	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	63	.661	n.s.	n.s.	.282	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	64	.261	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.758	n.s.	n.s.
	65	.842	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	66	.721	n.s.	.326	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	67	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.220	n.s.	n.s.
	68	.654	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	69	.476	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.309	n.s.
	70	.380	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	71	.760	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	72	.690	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.245	-.290	n.s.
	73	.357	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.260	n.s.	n.s.
	74	.294	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	75	.383	.466	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	76	.594	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	77	.606	.374	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	78	.811	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	79	.426	.224	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.358	.254
	80	.308	.358	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	81	.689	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.264	n.s.	n.s.
	82	.445	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	83	.640	n.s.	.363	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	84	.620	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-.256	n.s.	n.s.
	85	.637	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	86	.440	n.s.	.660	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	87	.707	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	88	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	89	.736	n.s.	.239	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
	90	.648	n.s.	.252	n.s.	n.s.	-.359	n.s.

Significance defined as $\geq$ .220